

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

REFERENCE MATERIAL

Do not Remove
from the Library

REFERENCE MATERIAL

Do not Remove
from the Library


104897

Property of
FAMILY OF FAITH
LIBRARY

REFERENCE MATERIAL

Do not Remove
from the Library





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2024

PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER'S WORKS.

"Topics of profound interest to the studious inquirer after truth are discussed by the author with his characteristic breadth of view, catholicity of judgment, affluence of learning, felicity of illustration, and force of reasoning. . . . His singular candor disarms the prepossessions of his opponents. . . . In these days of pretentious, shallow, and garrulous scholarship, his learning is as noticeable for its solidity as for its compass."

—N. Y. TRIBUNE.

History of the Christian Church. 8vo, with Maps, - - - -	\$3.50
Supernatural Origin of Christianity. New Edition, Crown 8vo, -	2.50
The Reformation. New Edition, Crown 8vo, - - - -	2.50
The Beginnings of Christianity. New Edition, Crown 8vo, - -	2.50
Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief. Crown 8vo, - - -	2.50
Discussions in History and Theology. 8vo, - - - -	3.00
Faith and Rationalism. New Edition, 12mo, - - - -	.75
The Christian Religion. New Edition, 16mo, - - - -	.50
Manual of Christian Evidences. 16mo, - - - -	.75
The Nature and Method of Revelation. 12mo, - - - -	1.25
Manual of Natural Theology. 16mo, - - - -	.75

HISTORY

OF

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

BY

GEORGE PARK FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

TITUS STREET PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN VALE UNIVERSITY

WITH MAPS

EIGHTEENTH THOUSAND

NEW YORK

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

1897

COPYRIGHT, 1887, BY
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS

DEDICATED

AS A TOKEN OF FRIENDSHIP

TO CHARLES AND ARTHUR SCRIBNER

WITH AFFECTIONATE RECOLLECTIONS OF THEIR

FATHER AND BROTHER

PREFACE.

I HAVE thought it practicable to bring within the compass of this volume, in a not unreadable form, the most important facts of Church History. On the question what it is wise to insert in such a work, and what it is best to exclude, no two persons would judge precisely alike. I must anticipate that readers will occasionally be disappointed in seeking what they do not find, or in finding what they may think it as well to have left out.

There are two particulars in which I have sought to make the narrative specially serviceable. In the first place, the attempt has been made to exhibit fully the relations of the history of Christianity and of the Church to contemporaneous secular history. It has been common to dissect Church history out of the general history of mankind. To some extent this process of division is required. Yet it must never be forgotten that they are really inseparable parts of one whole. I have tried to bring out more distinctly than is usually done the interaction of events and changes in the political sphere, with the phenomena which belong more strictly to the ecclesiastical and religious province. In the second place, it has seemed to me possible to present a tolerably complete survey of the history of theological doctrine. It is true that compressed statements must be made; but the important point is, not what amount of space is occupied, but whether the exposition is clear and exact.

There are two reasons, at least, why it is natural to feel some diffidence in sending forth a work of this kind from the press. One is the difficulty of traversing so wide a field without falling into inaccuracies of more or less consequence. It is pleasant to remember that—where there is painstaking and an

intention to tell the truth—an author's most lenient judges are the historical students, who know by experience how difficult it is to avoid errors. The other source of embarrassment is the necessity of pronouncing judgment on so great a number of persons, and on so many matters which are still more or less in dispute. Fully sensible of the responsibility of such a task, I can only say that I have fulfilled it with an honest desire to avoid all unfairness. It has appeared to me better to express frankly the conclusions to which my investigations have led me, on a variety of topics where differences of opinion exist, than to take refuge in ambiguity or silence. Something of the dispassionate temper of an on-looker may be expected to result from historical studies, if long pursued; nor is this an evil, if there is kept alive a warm sympathy with the spirit of holiness and love, wherever it is manifest.

As this book is designed, not for technical students exclusively, but for intelligent readers generally, the temptation to enter into extended and minute discussions on perplexed or controverted topics has been resisted. For example, as regards the earliest organization of the Church, while I feel a strong interest in the inquiries which have been prosecuted lately by Hatch, Adolf Harnack, Heinrici, Weizsäcker, and others, relative to the presbyterial office and kindred topics, I have abstained from recording any results which, as it appears to me, still await satisfactory proof. With the conclusions of Lightfoot, in his Edition of Clement, and in his "Philippians," I concur at present, although I am ready for further light.

The plan of dispensing with foot-notes has prevented me from making reference occasionally to modern writers on different portions of the subject, where it would have been a pleasure, if not an obligation, so to do. Besides Neander, Gieseler, and the other masters, who have passed away, there are numerous living scholars, in Great Britain as well as on the Continent, to whom I can offer no tribute but that of silent thankfulness from one engaged in the same studies with themselves. I will not deny myself, however, the satisfaction of owning my not infrequent indebtedness to the writings of my learned and esteemed friend, Dr. Schaff. Church History, like the other sciences, has made no inconsiderable progress in the

last few decades. The publications of Baur and of other authors of the Tübingen school induced more exhaustive researches into the early history of Christianity and the Church; and these have corrected the exaggerations which grew out of a bias of philosophical opinion and the undue fascination exercised by a plausible theory containing in it elements of truth. The Tübingen criticism threw light on the subjects which it handled, but its best service was the indirect one of stimulating inquiry.

I have received important assistance in composing this book from my pupil, Mr. Henry E. Bourne, who was graduated at the Yale Divinity School the present year. On the basis of manuscript notes of my lectures, at my request, and under my supervision, he undertook to write out a number of chapters, to be afterwards submitted to me for amendment. He more than fulfilled his task, as well in regard to the contents as the form of these chapters; for he incorporated matter of much value, derived from his own reading. I owe, moreover, to the diligence of this promising young scholar the making of the Index.

My friend, Mr. William L. Kingsley, has once more given me the benefit of his criticisms in the revisal of the proof-sheets.

G. P. F.

NEW HAVEN, September 1, 1887.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
SCOPE AND DIVISIONS OF CHURCH HISTORY,	1

THE ANCIENT ERA.

PERIOD I.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE (1-100).

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF THE WORLD : THE GENTILE AND THE JEW,	7
---	---

CHAPTER II.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH,	17
---------------------------------------	----

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE : CHRISTIAN WORSHIP : CHRISTIAN TEACHING,	37
--	----

PERIOD II.

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO CONSTANTINE (100-313).

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL : ROMAN PERSECUTIONS,	45
--	----

CHAPTER II.

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCH,	51
--	----

CHAPTER III.

	PAGE
CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP,	59

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE AND DOCTRINE,	68
--	----

PERIOD III.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY I. (313-590).

THE SUPREMACY OF THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH,	87
--	----

CHAPTER II.

CHANGES OF ORGANIZATION: ADVANCEMENT OF THE ROMAN SEE, .	99
--	----

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP,	110
---------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE,	121
--------------------------------	-----

PERIOD IV.

FROM GREGORY I. TO CHARLEMAGNE (590-800).

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH AMONG THE GERMANIC NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY: THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MO- HAMMEDANISM,	144
--	-----

CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIAN LIFE: CHRISTIAN WORSHIP: CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY	155
---	-----

THE MEDIÆVAL ERA.

PERIOD V.

FROM CHARLEMAGNE TO POPE GREGORY VII. (800-1073).

THE GROWTH OF THE PAPACY.

CHAPTER I.

PAGE

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY, 163

CHAPTER II.

THE POLITY OF THE CHURCH, AND THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH
TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY, 168

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP : CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, . . . 175

PERIOD VI.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO BONIFACE VIII. (1073-1294).

THE FULL SWAY OF THE PAPACY IN WESTERN EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

THE POLITY AND THE SECULAR RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH, FROM
THE ACCESSION OF HILDEBRAND TO THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS
(1073-1122), 182

CHAPTER II.

THE POLITY AND SECULAR RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH, FROM THE
CONCORDAT OF WORMS TO THE DEATH OF INNOCENT III. (1122-
1216), 187

CHAPTER III.

THE POLITY AND THE POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH, FROM
THE DEATH OF INNOCENT III. TO THE ACCESSION OF BONIFACE
VIII. (1216-1294), 195

CHAPTER IV.

	PAGE
MONASTICISM IN THIS PERIOD,	203

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE,	208
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VI.

SOME ASPECTS OF RELIGION AND WORSHIP IN THE MIDDLE AGES, .	227
--	-----

PERIOD VII.

FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE POSTING OF LUTHER'S
THESES (1294-1517).

THE DECLINE OF THE PAPACY AND MOVEMENTS TOWARD RE-
FORM.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY, FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE COUN- CIL OF PISA (1294-1409),	240
---	-----

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMING COUNCILS: THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY TO THE ACCESSION OF PIUS II. (1409-1458),	254
--	-----

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY IN THE LAST HALF OF THE FIF- TEENTH CENTURY,	264
---	-----

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION: THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING,	271
---	-----

THE MODERN ERA.

*PERIOD VIII.*FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION TO THE
PEACE OF WESTPHALIA (1517-1648).THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF PROTESTANTISM: THE CONFLICT
OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY, FROM THE POSTING OF LUTHER'S THESES TO THE DIET OF AUGSBURG (1517-1530), . . .	287

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND; IN SCANDINAVIAN AND SLAVO- NIAN COUNTRIES, AND IN HUNGARY: THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY UNTIL THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG (1555), . . .	306
---	-----

CHAPTER III.

JOHN CALVIN AND THE GENEVAN REFORMATION, . . .	318
--	-----

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE,	330
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER V.

THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS,	341
---	-----

CHAPTER VI.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND,	346
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE REFORMATION IN ITALY AND SPAIN: THE CATHOLIC COUNTER- REFORMATION,	383
---	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND IN THE REIGN OF JAMES I. AND CHARLES I.: THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR: THE PAPACY: THE EASTERN CHURCH,	394
---	-----

CHAPTER IX.

	PAGE
POLITY AND WORSHIP IN PROTESTANT CHURCHES,	413

CHAPTER X.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE,	423
------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XI.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS,	449
-------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER XII.

PROTESTANT SETTLEMENTS AND COMMUNITIES IN AMERICA, . . .	459
--	-----

*PERIOD IX.*FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE PRESENT
TIME (1648-1887).CHANGES AND CONFLICTS CONSEQUENT ON A NEW ERA IN
CULTURE AND SCIENCE: SOCIAL REFORM: A NEW STAGE
OF MISSIONARY CONQUEST.

CHAPTER I.

ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS IN THE LAST HALF OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY,	484
---	-----

CHAPTER II.

ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE IN THE EIGH- TEENTH CENTURY, PRIOR TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, . . .	497
--	-----

CHAPTER III.

RELIGION IN ENGLAND AND REVIVALS IN AMERICA IN THE EIGH- TEENTH CENTURY,	509
---	-----

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE PERIOD OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE FALL OF NAPOLEON,	527
--	-----

CHAPTER V.

	PAGE
THE PAPACY SINCE THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I. : CHRISTIANITY IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES,	532

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES,	559
---	-----

CHAPTER VII.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS,	582
-------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE,	598
--------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIAN PIETY AND CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPY,	641
---	-----

 APPENDIX.

I.

LIST OF GENERAL COUNCILS,	665
-------------------------------------	-----

II.

LIST OF POPES FROM GREGORY I. TO LEO XIII.,	666
---	-----

III.

NOTES ON THE LITERATURE OF CHURCH HISTORY,	671
--	-----

INDEX,	699
------------------	-----

MAPS.

	FACING PAGE
THE ROMAN EMPIRE AT ITS WIDEST EXTENT,	6
JOURNEYS OF PAUL,	20
MAP OF RELIGIONS AT THE ACCESSION OF JUSTINIAN, . . .	98
THE ROMAN EMPIRE DIVIDED INTO PREFECTURES AND DIOCESES,	104
EMPIRE OF THE SARACENS ABOUT A.D. 750,	156
EUROPE IN THE TIME OF CHARLEMAGNE,	158
EUROPE IN THE MIDDLE OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY, . .	286
THE RELIGIONS OF THE WORLD,	596
CHART OF RELIGIOUS STATISTICS,	580

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.

INTRODUCTION:

SCOPE AND DIVISIONS OF CHURCH HISTORY.

It belongs to the history of the Church to describe the rise and progress of that community which had its beginnings in Palestine more than eighteen centuries ago, and of which Jesus of Nazareth was the founder. It is the function of Church history to recount the effects wrought by the religion of Christ in successive ages in the world of mankind. When his followers were few and with no apparent prospect of gaining power and influence, he pronounced them "the light of the world" and "the salt of the earth." To a small company of chosen disciples he committed the task of going forward with the work which he had begun of laying the foundations of the kingdom of God among men. In that kingdom, as far and as fast as it should advance, mankind were to be penetrated with his spirit, united together in fraternal union, and brought "nigh unto God," their common Father. In this Christian society of the redeemed, prophetic glimpses of which had been caught beforehand by the ancient seers, the spirit of justice and of love was to supplant all selfish impulses and principles. It was involved in the divine idea that the new kingdom should not extirpate, but ennoble, the normal activities of human nature, and appropriate whatever is genuine and of durable worth in the culture and civilization of the race. The conception of the kingdom of God, the idea and the goal of history, is the bond of union between the Old Testament religion and the religion of the gospel. The history of Israel pointed and led up to the coming Messiah. The Messiah came, not "for that nation only," but to be the Saviour of the world. Before his coming, the kingdom existed in its rudimentary national form. Through him it

What is
Church his-
tory?

broke through the shell in which it was confined and for the time protected. Having attained through him to its mature spiritual form, it was ready to start on its career of conquest.

Jesus likened the external progress of Christianity in the future, as it lay before his mind, to the growth of a grain of mustard-seed. It is the least of all seeds—a minute, insignificant germ ; but the product of it overshadows every other garden plant, and becomes a tree large enough for the birds to settle in its branches. This parable points naturally to the territorial progress of Christianity from land to land. The spiritual effect of Christianity, its power to transform the minds and hearts of men, and to renovate society, Jesus compared to the operation of leaven “hid in three measures of meal.” Under one or the other of these striking similes the various aspects of Church history may all be grouped. From these

Divisions of
Church history : I. Mis-
sions.

points of view it may be studied. There is, first, the history of Christian missions. The gospel was a religion to be propagated. It was not “a cloistered virtue” to be cherished in secret by a body of devotees. The injunction was to preach it to every creature. Under this general topic of the spread of Christianity falls the narrative of persecutions, or efforts to suppress it, or to stay its progress, by force. There have been three principal eras of missionary conquest. The first embraces the conversion of the ancient Roman Empire to the Christian faith and the downfall of heathenism within its borders. The second comprises the conversion of the uncivilized nations, especially those of Teutonic blood, by which the empire of Rome was subverted, and which were to become the standard-bearers of modern civilization. The third includes the modern missionary age, in particular the last two centuries, which have witnessed a fresh outburst of missionary zeal. The second general topic is the history of Church

II. Polity.

polity. From the beginning Christians were united in a visible society, with its own officers and methods of discipline. They have been connected together under different and changing systems of organization. Thus from a simpler mode of ecclesiastical government an hierarchical polity grew up. Out of this polity in Western Europe the papacy was developed. As a result of the Reformation new methods of Church government more in keeping with its spirit were framed. The Church in the early centuries, the various Christian bodies in later times, have stood in more or less intimate relations to the state. Between civil government and the Church there have been different degrees of union and separation, and a reciprocal influence momentous in its effect. This relation of

ecclesiastical to civil authority, and the phases through which it has passed, is embraced under the present rubric. Thirdly, Christian-

III. *Doctrine.* ity was a doctrine. The teaching of its founders was presented in authoritative sacred books. Hence, theology gradually arose. The effort to formulate the gospel and to construct a system of Christian truth began early, and it has never been discontinued. In the course of it there have been earnest studies and high debates within the Church, and numerous conflicts with persons and parties beyond its pale. Theologians have labored to define Christianity, to repel attacks upon the Christian faith, and to adjust the teachings of the Bible to the conclusions of philosophy and science. Thus the history of doctrine and of the formation of creeds and confessions forms a distinct branch of

IV. *Christian life.* historical investigation. Fourthly, Christianity was a practical system in its purpose and effect. It aimed to mould anew the hearts and the lives of its adherents. It was far more than a creed to be learned and recited. It was the source of a new life in the soul. It set up moral standards for the regulation of conduct. From it sprung new ethical rules, new habits, new social customs. It shone upon the earth like the sun in the spring-time, bringing softer breezes and verdure on the hill-sides. The entire work of Christianity in respect to the practical life, as well as the maxims and sentiments of its disciples from age to age, falls under this department. Here is the place for considering the various types of Christian experience that have arisen, and institutions, like monasticism, an offshoot of devotional tendencies. Here belongs the record of Christian charity. The generic topic is the Christian life, in the comprehensive sense of the term. Finally, Christianity created a distinct *cultus*—forms of worship peculiar to itself.

V. *Christian worship.* These have not remained unaltered. They have experienced wide variations for better or for worse. Under this division is treated the ritual of the Church in its different branches, and in the successive ages. Among the particular topics are Church architecture, ecclesiastical observances, liturgies, hymns, and Church music.

The sum total of the historical effects of Christianity might thus be comprehended under these five heads: Missions, Polity, Christian Doctrine, Christian Life, Christian Worship.

In narrating the life of an individual, we first take into view the circumstances of time and place that surrounded him at his birth. It is these that act upon him at the starting-point of his career, and constitute the sphere in which he is to shape his course. We

do the like in history, the biography of society. In recounting the history of the Church, we pause at the threshold to survey the condition of the world in the midst of which the Christian religion had its origin. The child that was born in Bethlehem, in Judea, was the Son of Mary as well as the Son of God. His mother was a Jewish maiden. He grew up in the household of a Galilean carpenter. There lay back of him the whole history of Israel. What he would do and what he would suffer, what treatment awaited him and his followers, what method of activity he and they would be moved to adopt, what special form the community that he was to call into being would take—these were questions which the conditions already ordained by Providence would have their part in deciding. Whether a river, when it leaves its fountain, shall spread over a wide surface, or send its full current through a narrow gorge, whether its waters shall flow smoothly on, or descend in a steep, tumultuous torrent, depends on the configuration of the country through which its path is appointed to run.

Chronological divisions in history should coincide with epochs when extraordinary changes occurred. It is not definite quantities of time, but turning-points in the course of events, that should determine the dividing lines. Church history falls naturally into three principal eras—ancient, mediæval, and modern. The ancient era comprises the history of Christianity in the Græco-Roman world, prior to the fall of the Western Roman Empire, and during the migrations and conquests of the Germanic tribes. It terminates at the reconstitution of the empire of the West under a Christian sovereign of German blood, Karl the Great, called Charlemagne. The ancient era extends over the first eight centuries. At the end of this era we find that the authority once exercised by the Roman Cæsars has been transferred to the new transalpine races, now allied to the Church of Rome, and linked to the papacy, which has replaced the old imperial by a new spiritual ascendancy. Now begins the mediæval era, which extends over the long interval from Charlemagne to Luther and the Protestant Reformation, at the opening of the sixteenth century. During the Middle Ages, the Eastern Church, whose connection with the Church of the West was gradually sundered, lay benumbed under the despotic rule of the Byzantine emperors. A lethargy, intellectual and moral, pervaded the Christian communities in the East. In the West, on the contrary, this era was full of life and energy, was fertile in changes. It was signalized by the predom-

The prelude
to Church history.

Chronological
divisions.

inance of the Latin hierarchy and of the papacy, followed, however, in the later centuries by a gradual undermining of papal authority. At the Reformation, the dominion of the popes was thrown off by the nations of Teutonic lineage; the traditional creed was reconstructed in the light of the Scriptures; doctrinal conflicts were waged among the different Christian bodies; a new epoch in culture and civilization appeared. Out of this change, in the process of adjusting the relations of philosophy and science to religion, earnest inquiries and controversies arose; yet, at the same time, the gospel revealed its latent energy as an instrument of political and social reform, and the churches with a new zeal engaged in the work of propagating the gospel among heathen nations. Such, in brief, are the characteristics of the modern era, down to the present time. In general, the ages before the Reformation may be described as the *ecclesiastical* period of Church history. It is the period when the polity, the ritual, the official personages, the entire fabric of a complex ecclesiastical system, were more prominent. On the other hand, in the recent era, other elements, including the ethical side of Christianity, have advanced to the foreground. This distinction holds good especially of the last two centuries, in contrast with the prevailing spirit of the Middle Ages.

Before making so extensive a journey it is well to sketch the boundary lines of river and mountain with some particularity.

Division into periods. Each of the principal eras—ancient, mediæval, and modern—breaks into distinct sections. As we descend

the historic stream we arrive at intermediate points where the channel turns in another direction or where the scenery assumes a new aspect. The first subordinate period covers the interval between the founding of the Church and the end of the Apostolic age, or the close of the first century. From this date to the edict of toleration, issued by Constantine in 313, the Church was a sect in the Roman Empire, under the ban of the laws and enduring at times severe persecution. Then its ascendancy was assured; it became the dominant religion in the Roman state. Within the

The Old Catholic Church. limits of this period, in the last years of the second century, there occurs another epoch, of less moment, to be sure, yet of much importance. At this time we find that the Church has drawn apart from heretical parties and has formed a more compact organization under the episcopate, special honor and credit being accorded to prominent sees of Apostolic origin, as pillars of orthodoxy. Thus the Old Catholic, as distinguished from the later Roman Catholic, Church emerges into being. In the interval

from about 300 to 600, or from Constantine to Pope Gregory I., Christianity as professed by the Church, and as defined through councils, presents itself as the acknowledged faith of the Roman Empire, East and West. In the subsequent two centuries, from 600 to 800, or from Gregory I. to Charlemagne, the gospel is received by the Teutonic nations, over whom the sway of the Church is established. In the three centuries that follow next, the sway of the papacy is more and more built up in Western Europe. They bring us to the advanced assertions of pontifical authority, in the age of Hildebrand, or Gregory VII., who became pope in 1073. He ushers in the flourishing era of papal domination, which continues to the end of the thirteenth century, or to the papal reign of Boniface VIII., when its prestige and authority began to wane. But even then two centuries elapsed before the Protestant revolt began, centuries during which the forces that produced that great revolt were slowly gathering. Thus we are carried to the beginning of the sixteenth century. The age of the Reformation was attended and followed by contests, both doctrinal and political, down to the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, by which the Thirty Years' War was brought to an end. At about this date may be placed the dawn of the recent period. It is characterized by a new spirit in philosophy and culture, by discussions consequent on the spread of scientific investigation, by debates on the foundations of natural and revealed religion. It is characterized, also, by the growth of Christian philanthropy, the progress of political and social reform, and the fresh awakening of missionary effort.

The following is a summary view of the course of Church history, to which corresponds the plan of the present work :—

PERIOD I. The Beginnings of Christianity, or the Apostolic Age, to A.D. 100.

PERIOD II. The Progress of Christianity until Constantine. A.D. 313.

PERIOD III. The Supremacy of the Church in the Roman World, to A.D. 590.

PERIOD IV. The Founding of the Church among the Germanic Nations, to A.D. 800.

PERIOD V. The Growth of the Papacy : to the Pontificate of Gregory VII., A.D. 1073.

PERIOD VI. The Full Sway of the Papacy in Western Europe : to the Accession of Pope Boniface VIII., A.D. 1294.

PERIOD VII. The Decline of the Papacy and Movements toward Reform : to the posting of Luther's Theses, A.D. 1517.

PERIOD VIII. The Reformation, and conflicts of the different Christian bodies : to the Peace of Westphalia, A.D. 1648.

PERIOD IX. Changes and Conflicts consequent on a new era in Culture, Philosophy, and Science ; Social Reform ; a New Stage of Missionary Conquest : to the present time.

THE ANCIENT ERA

PERIOD I.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE (1-100).

CHAPTER I.

THE STATE OF THE WORLD: THE GENTILE AND THE JEW.

THE condition of the civilized nations at the birth of Christ was propitious for the introduction and spread of a new religion, in its nature adapted to all mankind. Under the sovereignty of Rome, beneath the shield of law and of a government that enforced order, they were combined into one vast political body. The world had experienced the benefit of two potent civilizing agencies, Greek culture and Roman sway. The old mythological religions, which sprung originally from a deifying of nature, had fallen into decay and lost their hold on the intelligent class. Nothing had arisen to fill the void thus created. The loss of faith, as might be expected, engendered the two extremes of superstition and infidelity, neither of them satisfying, and both repugnant to the best minds. Philosophy had done an important work in enlarging and educating the intellect, but it had proved itself in the main powerless to keep alive religious faith, to curb the passions, or to provide hope and consolation in distress. "Having no hope and without God in the world," an Apostle's description of the heathen generally, was eminently true at this period. Meantime the whole course of events which resulted in the upbuilding of imperial Rome had produced and diffused abroad in the civilized nations a profligacy which probably has had no parallel, before or since, in the annals of the race. The loosening of the bonds of morality, the prevalence of vice, not to dwell on the remorse and fears of conscience that haunted souls not hardened in evil, could not fail to awaken in many a sense of the need of a more effectual restraint

than heathen worship, or Greek letters and philosophy, or Roman civil law could furnish. There was a craving, more or less obscurely felt, for a new regenerating force that should enter with life-giving efficacy into the heart of ancient society. The age was ripe and ready for the incoming of such an epoch. "In the fulness of time God sent forth his Son."

When Christ was born, which was four years before the date assigned in our calendar for the beginning of the Christian era, the

The empire
under Augustus,
B.C. 31-
A.D. 14

Roman world was governed by Augustus Cæsar. His triumph over the republican leaders by whom his grand-uncle, Julius Cæsar, had been slain, and his subsequent naval victory, at Actium, over his colleague and rival, Mark Antony, had made him undisputed master of the empire. His authority in the capital and in the provinces was practically absolute, although it was exercised under the forms of the extinct republic which the earlier Cæsar had subverted. The policy of Augustus was defensive and peaceful. It was after his reign, in the first century, that Britain, which had been repeatedly invaded, was at last, in 85, conquered as far as the friths of Scotland, and later still, in 106, that Dacia, on the north of the Danube, became a province. The Roman dominion extended from that river to the cataracts of the Nile and the desert of Africa on the south, and stretched eastward from the Atlantic to the Euphrates. There was no defined boundary between the regions of the East and of the West, whose differing characteristics had much to do afterwards in effecting the political separation between them, and, later still, in dividing the Greek from the Latin Church. The diffusion of political privileges, including the boon of Roman citizenship, was gradually raising the provinces to a common level, and converting Rome into the metropolis, instead of the mistress, of the empire. Yet to be a Roman citizen was still a coveted privilege among the subjects of the emperor, whether near or remote. It conferred important privileges. It was a safeguard against various indignities and dangers. Nominally, at least, it made the possessor of it a member of the ruling class in the state.

Whatever tended to break down the barriers of national and race antipathy, and to produce unity and a sense of unity among men, paved the way for a just appreciation of the Christian religion when it should appear, and would serve to help on its progress. The subjection in common of so many nations to one government of itself acted strongly in this direction. Beyond the external advantages, such as the protection of life, the

Sense of unity
produced by
Rome.

preservation of order, and the facilitating of intercourse, which the sway of Rome secured, the natural effect of it was to evoke a feeling of unity. The system of Roman law, administered wherever there were Roman citizens, was an educating influence of a like tendency.

The mutual influence of the Greeks and Latins, and the united effect of the Greek and Latin languages and culture, not only enlarged and enriched the minds of men, but also served to form a groundwork of intellectual and moral sympathy.

The Greeks
and the Latins.

Among all the peoples that have appeared on the stage of history the Greeks are the most eminent for literary and artistic genius. Their wonderful creations in literature, science, philosophy, and art were fast becoming the common property of the nations. It was the reasonable boast of Plato, that while other races, as the Phœnicians, had been devoted to money-making, the Greeks, in intellectual power and achievement, excelled them all. Greek letters were widely disseminated in the East by the conquests of Alexander. To him the populous and prosperous city of Alexandria in Egypt, which was planted in 332 B.C., owed its foundation. Alexandria became a flourishing seat of Greek learning, a centre where the streams of Hellenic and Oriental culture were mingled. A rival city, in rank the second city in the East, was Antioch in Syria, founded, in 300 B.C., by Seleucus Nicator. The fall of Greek liberty and the subjugation of Greece by the Romans gave an additional impetus to the spread of the Greek population in all quarters. In early times their settlements had been scattered along the coasts and on the islands of the Mediterranean. Greek at length grew to be the language of commerce, the vehicle of polite intercourse, and a common medium of communication through all the eastern portion of the empire. The Latin tongue, the language of Roman officials and of the Roman legions, was carried wherever Roman conquests and colonies went. West of the Adriatic, especially in Italy, Gaul, Spain, and North Africa, it prevailed as the Greek prevailed elsewhere.

Under the reign of Augustus an increased stimulus was given to travel and intercourse between different parts of the Roman world.

There were journeys of civil and military officers, and the marching of legions from one place to another. Piracy

Travel and
intercourse.

had been suppressed, and now that peace was established there was a vast increase of trade and commerce, in which the Jews everywhere took an active part. There was much travelling for health and for pleasure. Roman youth studied at Athens and visited the antiquities of Egypt and of the East. Provincials were eager to

see Rome. From curiosity, to get employment or largesses, to buy and to sell, to find or to furnish amusement, they flocked to the capital.

As all religions were national, when the independence of a nation broke down, a shock was necessarily given to religious faith. Diffusion of skepticism. Where were the gods that they did not shield and rescue their worshippers? The mingling of so many diverse systems of religion, with their motley varieties of ritual, tended to undermine the credence which they had attracted from their votaries. Still more, the expansion of intellect, the observation of nature, reflection, and philosophy inspired disbelief in the mythological legends and ideas. Greek skepticism spread through the Roman educated classes. Cultivated men wondered that soothsayers who chanced to meet, could look one another in the face without laughing. Roman officials whose office it was to superintend religious rites, in private treated them, and the imaginary divinities in whose honor they were solemnly practised, with derision. This disbelief among the educated often extended to the essential truths of natural religion, such as the existence of God and the future life. Where these truths were defended, writers, as in the case of Cicero, frequently made no reference to them in the exigencies where an earnest faith would have been likely to express itself.

The ancient philosophy may be contemplated from two points of view, either as comprising attempts to answer hard questions, to solve problems respecting the universe, man and his destiny, or as a means of practical guidance and solace.

The ancient philosophy : its founders. Socrates was the founder of philosophy in its higher departments. With the exception of Pythagoras (580-500 B.C.), a mystic and ascetic, not without elevated ideas, the earlier speculation dealt exclusively with physics or natural philosophy. With Socrates (469-399 B.C.) the soul was the absorbing theme, virtue and moral improvement the prime objects of attention. He asserted theism, divine government and providence, the supreme obligation to obey conscience, the guilt and folly of unrighteousness. He believed, though not without a mixture of doubt, in personal immortality; but he shared in the common faith in a multiplicity of divinities, and laid too great stress on knowledge or intellectual insight as a necessary ingredient of virtue. By the earnestness and nobleness of his teaching, enforced by the serenity with which he endured death as a martyr, he exerted a powerful and lasting influence. The two main systems that sprung up on the basis of his doctrine were those of Plato (429-348 B.C.) and of Aristotle.

The lofty, spiritual character of Plato's philosophy is congenial with the tone of the gospel. He was a theist, but with the qualification that he not only held matter to be eternal, but also believed in a realm of "ideas," the patterns or archetypes of all realities, and existing side by side with the Deity. Virtue he defined to be likeness to God according to the measure of human ability. Like the other philosophers, however, he could present no adequate conception of God, knew of no form of human association or brotherhood except the State, and made the highest good accessible only to the more gifted in intellect. Aristotle (384-322 B.C.) was a theist, conceiving of God as the first cause of motion, as absorbed in self-contemplation, and with a personality incomplete and obscure. His mastery is chiefly seen in the discussion of practical morals, but especially in the various sciences which stand in no vital relation to religion. After Aristotle, speculative thought declined. In philosophy, the spirit of individualism gained ground; the State was no longer held to comprehend all the good possible to man; there was a broader outlook on humanity, and a quest for inward strength and peace amid all the mutations of the world. The two main systems that emerged were the Epicurean and the Stoic. The disciples of Epicurus (342-270 B.C.) made happiness the end and aim of life, and identified virtue with prudence in the pursuit of it. They admitted the existence of the gods, but denied that they take any interest in the affairs of the world. The Cynics, the followers of Antisthenes (c. 366 B.C.), presented a caricature of the doctrine of Socrates by carrying the low esteem of outward good to the extreme of contempt, and of disdain of the ordinary comforts of life. Diogenes (412-323 B.C.), whom Plato described as Socrates gone mad, and whose coarse austerities gave rise to the story that he had made his abode in a tub or cask, was a great light in this sect. The Stoics did not copy the extravagance of the Cynics, their forerunners. Zeno (358-260 B.C.) and Chrysippus (280-207 B.C.), the founders of the Stoic sect, declared virtue to be the supreme good. To live according to nature, was their chief maxim. Reason was to dominate in the soul; all rebellious emotions were to be subdued. The individual is to acquiesce in whatever occurs, without an inward murmur. The apathy of the Stoic is not a mere passive mood; it is an active, willing resignation. An impersonal fate rules all, but the course of things is according to reason and law. The world runs through a cycle; fire is the primary element, and all things will end in a final conflagration. The sage, from the serene height of his self-

Philosophy
after Aristotle.

control, looks with tranquillity on whatever may take place. In the later Stoics, the harsh features of the system were softened. The Stoic idea of a brotherhood of mankind is impressively set forth by Epictetus (c. 50–c. 120). Marcus Aurelius (121–180) stands on the same lofty plane; and in Seneca (c. 3 B.C.–65 A.D.), the tutor of Nero, the personality of God and the reality of a future life are distinctly recognized, while in various precepts this philosopher breathes a humane spirit akin to the gospel. The Stoic philosophy offered no satisfactory view of the universe and of its design. As a practical system, it lacked humility, and, in its unadulterated form, hardened the heart; but it had no small influence in diffusing abroad the idea of mankind as forming a single community. In its later influence, it mitigated the severity of

Later
Stoicism.

Service of
Philosophy:
its later
phases.

Roman law. On the whole, the ancient philosophy did a work resembling in some degree that of the Old Testament law, in training the conscience. It kindled aspirations—for example, the yearning for a more intimate communion of mankind—which only the kingdom of God could meet. In this respect it was unconsciously prophetic. But philosophy, in the age when the gospel appeared, in the hands of the new Platonic school, had lapsed into pantheism. There was an eclectic tendency, a disposition to cull fragments of doctrine here and there, and to amalgamate systems with one another, just as there was a prevailing drift towards what is called *syncretism* in religion—the combination of elements drawn from the creeds and cults of different nations.

The state of morals in the Augustan age is depicted in as dark colors by Seneca as by Paul. Licentiousness and cruelty, the characteristic vices of ancient society, had been fostered by certain forms of heathen religion. The immoral tales of Greek mythology had been stigmatized as baneful to youth by Plato and Aristotle. By the downfall of liberty, and by intestine strife, Greek social life was demoralized. “The individual had begun to draw away more and more from the State,” and sunk morally to the position of “a man without a country.” Roman virtue gave way under the temptations to luxury and sensuality that followed upon the conquest of Greece and the plunder of the East. All ranks of Roman society were infected with the prevailing impurity. Immense sums were lavished upon luxurious banquets. Vices which may not even be named, were practised with impunity, and almost without reproach.¹ The multitude of slaves furnished

State of
morals.

¹ Romans i. 24–28.

boundless opportunities for sensual indulgence. Slaves, both in city and country, were often treated with extreme rigor. Infanticide was freely tolerated and practised. In the favorite Roman amusements, the stage, the circus, and the amphitheatre, the degradation of morals is most apparent. The stage became a school of vice and corruption. The taste for gladiatorial combats daily increased. In Rome and in other principal cities of the empire, multitudes of both sexes and of every age assembled to witness the bloody contests of men with wild beasts, and of human combatants with one another. The civil wars which, with occasional intervals, had raged from the conflict of Sulla and Marius to the triumph of Augustus had not only entailed unspeakable suffering upon the coun-

tries desolated by them, but had done much to break
88 B.C.-32 A.D.

up habits of industry and morality. The picture of ancient society, even at that epoch, has a brighter as well as a darker side. On the whole, however, the state of things was far from being hopeful. No remedy could be discerned for the reigning evils. Consequently, not a few minds were afflicted with despondency. It is remarkable that in the wreck of traditional beliefs, and in the vague yearning for an anchor in the dark and troubled sea, many were inclined to turn their eyes to the East, the seat of ancient, mysterious religions, in the hope of finding there light and help. At this crisis in the world's history, the Saviour was born.

Philosophy, science, culture, in the broad sense of the term, are the gift of the Greeks to mankind; law and civil polity are a legacy

from the Romans; but "salvation is of the Jews." They

The Jews.

had been of old conscious of a spiritual eminence among the nations of the earth. "For what great nation is there that hath a god so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is whensoever we call upon him? And what great nation is there that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law?"¹ Nor had they lost the sense of a high spiritual office that belonged to them in relation to the rest of mankind. But their national independence was gone forever. They had been swallowed up in the wide-spread "mon-

63-40 B.C.

archy of the Mediterranean." From the time of Hyrcanus II., the last of the Maccabean rulers, they had been subject to the Romans. By their will and consent,

37-4 B.C.

Herod, the son of Antipater, an Idumean proselyte, was made king. When Herod, an able ruler but a tyrant, died, his king-

¹ Deut. iv. 7, 8 (Revised Version).

dom was parcelled out among his three sons. Of these, after ten years, Archelaus tetrarch of Judea was dethroned, and banished to Vienne. Then Judea was annexed to the province of Syria, and ruled by procurators, one of whom was Pontius Pilate. Later, for a short time, the dominions of Herod were united under his grandson, Herod Agrippa I. At his death all Palestine was placed under procurators subordinate to the imperial governor of Syria.

Judea was the hearth-stone of the whole Jewish race, and contained within it the sanctuary to which Jews resorted at the great religious festivals. Jews were found in large numbers in almost all parts of the empire. A multitude of exiles had planted themselves permanently in Babylonia, instead of returning to Jerusalem with the caravans that followed Ezra (457 B.C.) and Nehemiah (444 B.C.). In Alexandria and its neighborhood they numbered not less than a million. Under the Ptolemies the Old Testament had been rendered into Greek (c. 250 B.C.), and this version, called the Septuagint, was in general use among the Hellenists, or Jews of the Dispersion, beyond the limits of Palestine. In Antioch and in other places in Syria, in the numerous cities of Asia Minor, in Cyprus, Crete, and other islands of the Mediterranean, in the cities of Greece, in Illyricum, in Rome and in other towns of Italy, Jews had settled in large numbers. They followed the example of the Phœnicians: wherever there was a prospect of gain through trade and commerce, Jewish merchants swarmed.

Since the days of the Babylonian exile, when their political independence was extinguished, never to be regained except during the interval after the Maccabean revolt (142–61 B.C.), the Jews had clung to their faith and worship with an unyielding tenacity. The loss of political unity had the effect to tighten the bands of race and of religion. The period of the prophets—the ninth and eighth centuries B.C., when, in the conflict with idolatry, and in the trials and perils of foreign invasion, the faith of Israel had burst forth like a flame of fire—the period of Elijah and Elisha, of Hosea and Amos, of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, had gone by. From the time of Ezra and the rebuilding of the temple, the law with its strictly defined ritual was in full force, and the priesthood had supreme control. This is termed the period of the hagiocracy or hierocracy—the age of sacerdotal rule. Even the Samaritans, the worshippers on Mount Gerizim, although they accepted the Pentateuch, were yet, as being of a mixed race, considered aliens and heretics. The steadfast resist-

The Jewish
Diaspora.

Period of the
hierocracy.

ance to Gentile error and corruption was maintained by the Pharisees, who, with the Sadducees, formed the two principal parties.

The Pharisees; the Sadducees; the Essenes.

They were parties, and not sects in the modern sense. The Pharisees, the "Separated," were the representatives of the strictest orthodoxy. They clung not only to the law, but also to the great body of traditional interpretation which had gathered about it. Mixed with their formalism was an intense, fanatical patriotism. They naturally tended to casuistry and quibbling, which gave rise to hypocrisy, and too often connected itself with a spirit of selfish greed and with joy in the reputation of sanctity. The Sadducees, so named from Zadok, a high-priest in the time of David, were composed mainly of the priestly nobility. The high sacerdotal offices were generally in their hands. They were not so hostile to foreigners and foreign influence. They ascribed normal authority to the law of the Pentateuch alone. They were infected with a rationalistic spirit, had no sympathy with the prevalent Messianic hopes, and disbelieved in the doctrine of the resurrection. Both parties were represented in the Sanhedrim, the great court or council, invested with judicial functions, having its seat at Jerusalem. In connection with the Pharisees stood the Scribes, the teachers and copyists of the sacred books. A third party, which may properly be called a sect, were the Essenes, numbering a few thousands. They dwelt chiefly in village communities, eastward of Jerusalem, towards the Dead Sea. Their strict organization, their mingling of manual labor with exercises of devotion, their renunciation of marriage and of property apart from the common stock, their methodical discipline with its fixed round of employments, gave them a resemblance to monastic societies or brotherhoods of a later date. The abjuring of sacrifices, and the invocation, in some obscure way, of the sun, were among

Alexandrian Judaism.

their principal differences from orthodox Judaism. Outside of Palestine, at Alexandria, arose a peculiar type of Jewish theology, in which the Platonic philosophy was curiously blended with Old Testament teaching. This was accomplished through the allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures. At Alexandria the books which we call apocryphal were taken up into the Old Testament canon. One of them, The Wisdom of Solomon, was

Philo.

written to commend the Alexandrian theology to the Jews of Palestine. The principal expounder of the Alexandrian Jewish philosophy was Philo, who was born about 20 B.C.

The centres of Jewish instruction and worship were the synagogues, which sprung up during and after the Exile. They were

found not only in Palestine, but also in all the towns of the Roman Empire of any considerable size, where Jews resided. The buildings were plain, rectangular edifices, either placed on an eminence or marked by a pole rising from the roof. The synagogues were under the management of "elders." In them, on the Sabbath, all faithful Jews met for prayer, and to hear and to study the law.

Although the Jews were hated for their exclusiveness, their zeal in making proselytes to their religion was attended, as the heathen writers attest, with great success. The proselytes were of two classes—"proselytes of righteousness," who were circumcised and acquired all, or nearly all, the privileges of a born Israelite, and "proselytes of the gate." These last were admitted to certain privileges on the condition of obeying what were called the seven Noachian precepts, which comprised the prohibition of uncleanness, of idolatry, and of the eating of "flesh with the blood thereof."

In this way monotheistic faith and worship had been planted in the Roman provinces and beyond their borders. Along with their immovable faith and their intense devotion to the law, the Jews in general looked for the coming of the day when the relation of ruler and subject would be reversed. They longed for the hour when they would be delivered from the galling yoke of foreign rule, and when dominion would be transferred to Jehovah's chosen people. The current interpretations of prophecy varied in form, and were more or less spiritual in their tenor. But the prevalent hope was of a political Messiah, who would throw off the hateful Roman domination, and give victory, and with it rest and comfort, to Israel. His throne was to be erected at Jerusalem. To the temple on Mount Zion all nations were to bring their gifts and oblations

CHAPTER II.

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH.

THE major part of the Jewish people were pining for deliverance from Roman tyranny. A few yearned for a more spiritual blessing —for peace of conscience and purity of heart, which the Messiah would bring to them. In this state of things there occurred a new and grand outburst of the spirit of prophecy, the final epoch in the progress of divine revelation. A great excitement was kindled by the preaching of John the Baptist, a prophet who in his stern and fearless spirit, as well as in his rough garb and austere mode of life, brought to mind his precursor, the ancient Elijah. In the wild and thinly settled region west of the Jordan he proclaimed to the awe-struck multitude, who flocked to hear him, the speedy advent of the Lord, and exhorted them to repentance. One of those who presented themselves for baptism was Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Mary, whose husband was Joseph. John would fain have declined to baptize him, and pointed him out as the predicted Messiah. Some of the disciples of the Baptist attached themselves to Jesus. Beginning at that time, the ministry of Christ continued for three and a half years, partly in Galilee, and in part, especially towards the end, in Jerusalem and its neighborhood. The common people were deeply moved by his teaching, for he spoke as one having authority, out of a deep well of spiritual intuition, and as one in intimate communion with God, by whom he declared himself to be sent. They were startled and impressed by his miracles of healing, and by other manifestations of supernatural power and of tender sympathy with human distress. But when he refused to countenance their longing for a violent revolution and for a temporal kingdom, they were easily persuaded to turn against him. At the same time, the Pharisees, stung by his unsparing exposure of their hypocrisy and spiritual pride, and dreading the overthrow of their influence, conspired to destroy him. The combination of leaders and populace resulted in his seizure, his arraignment before Caiaphas and Pilate,

and his crucifixion. He had looked forward to this result. He had watched the thickening cloud of envy and hatred which portended the storm that was to burst on his head. At the last, overwhelmed with sorrow, he neither yielded to distrust nor gave way to despair. Nor could his love be overcome by the blindness and malignity of those to whom he came to minister. He knew that notwithstanding his death, and even by means of it, the purpose of the Father to save the world through him would be accomplished. It was expected that his ignominious death as a criminal would be the extinction of his cause. His immediate followers, despite his attempts to prepare them for the catastrophe, were struck with sorrow and dismay. But an event soon occurred that raised them from their despondency, and inspired them, one and all, with joy and courage. On the third day after his death, and afterwards in a series of interviews, running through a definite period, he manifested himself alive to them, under circumstances that dispelled the doubts of the most incredulous man among them as to the reality of his resurrection. Their immovable faith in this fact was the basis of their preaching. It nerved them to endure ostracism and death. It lies at the foundation of Christianity as a power in the world's history. After his final departure out of their sight, the disciples at Jerusalem, in number about one hundred and twenty, met together. Among them were Mary the mother of Jesus, and also his four brothers, whose disbelief had probably been vanquished by the evident fact of his resurrection. With them were the eleven—Peter, the brothers John and James, Andrew the brother of Peter, Philip and Thomas, Nathanael, also called Bartholomew, Matthew, James the son of Alphæus, Simon, who before his call by Jesus had belonged to the faction of Zealots, fierce champions of the Mosaic ritual, and Judas the son of a James not otherwise known. All the twelve were Galileans except Judas Iscariot, or Judas of Kerioth, a place in Judea. On the lists of the Apostles¹ the name of Peter stands first. A certain precedence, not as implying rule, but conferred for his qualities as a leader, is given him by Jesus himself. Impulsive, impetuous, warm-hearted, he might falter under a sudden onset of temptation, but speedy penitence followed upon error. In the early period of Apostolic history he is foremost in the Apostolic company. At one of the meetings where the one hundred and twenty were all gathered, it was on the proposal of Peter that a certain Matthias,

The eleven
and Matthias.

¹ Matt. x. 2-4; Acts i. 13; Matt. xvi. 18; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15-18

who had been one of the companions of Christ, was appointed in the room of Judas the Betrayer, to be associated with the eleven as a witness of the Lord's resurrection. On the fiftieth day after the Passover and the crucifixion, on an occasion when the body of disciples were assembled together, startling and impressive tokens appeared of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit. These were miraculous manifestations. Beyond these it was the permanent indwelling of the Spirit in the souls of believers, as an illuminating and sanctifying power, that united them in one body.

With the day of Pentecost the career of the "Church militant" fairly begins. The fervor of the Apostles, who have now cast off their timidity, produces a powerful effect on the throng assembled at the festival from all quarters.¹ The speaking with tongues, according to Luke's account, went beyond the glowing, ecstatic utterances that are described under the same name as occurring later in the Apostolic churches. It was a prelude to a thrilling discourse of Peter, in which the guilt of putting to death the Messiah was charged with piercing emphasis upon his hearers, and the resurrection of Jesus and his reign on high were proclaimed. Thus the Apostles began, through their chief spokesman, to give their testimony to the world. A great number—according to Luke's statement, about three thousand—were moved by Peter's exhortation to profess repentance and to receive baptism.

The Apostles and the other disciples were Jews who believed that the Messiah had come, had died, had risen, and ascended, and would again appear in a visible form. As devout Jews they resorted to the temple, and kept up all the legal observances of the Mosaic ritual. But they formed together a brotherhood, in cordial fellowship. Their converts multiplied. The commotion caused by the miraculous healing of a cripple at a door of the temple led to the bringing of Peter and John before the Sanhedrim. The unabashed courage of these unlettered men excited amazement in that tribunal. It was judged expedient to dismiss them with a prohibition to teach in the name of Jesus, which, however, they did not obey.² The increase of the popular commotion and the spread of it beyond the limits of the city caused a second arraignment of Peter and John. On this occasion the Sadducees in the council showed special hostility, which was held in check by the temperate and politic advice given

The Church more distinct: the Apostles arraigned.

¹ Acts ii. 6-14.

² Acts iv. 18-21

by the Pharisaic doctor, Gamaliel.¹ The Apostles were scourged and again forbidden to preach ; but they were set free. It is plain that the comparatively peaceful course of things could last only until the disciples should be recognized as a distinct community. A step in this direction was taken in consequence of complaints of neglect in the distribution of alms, that came from the Hellenistic Jewish converts. This resulted in the appointment of a class of officers called deacons, to look after the poor. The success of one of them, Stephen, in his appeals to the Hellenists, his victories in oral debate, and especially the manner in which he set forth the universality of the gospel—which was construed into an attack on the Mosaic system as destined to pass away—roused bitter indignation. Dragged before the Sanhedrim, and summoned to answer his accusers, he went over in a rapid review the whole Jewish history, and broke out at length in a burning denunciation of the crimes that had reached their climax in the murder of the Righteous One. In a frenzy of rage the crowd would hear no more, but hurried him beyond the limits of the city, where he was stoned to death, with his last breath imploring the pardon of his murderers.

The murder of Stephen made an epoch in the history of the infant Church. It was the signal for a persecution that drove the disciples from Jerusalem and dispersed them in the neighboring districts. The Apostles alone remained in the city in some place of safety ; for inasmuch as Jerusalem was regarded by them as the centre of the new community and kingdom, it would not be right or seemly for them to forsake it. One of the deacons, Philip, probably a Hellenist, made converts in a city of Samaria. In Samaria, good seed had been sown by Jesus himself. Peter and John visited them, and laid their hands on them. They received thus the special gifts of the Spirit. It was these miraculous gifts that Simon Magus desired to purchase. There followed the conversion and baptism of the chamberlain of the Queen of Meroe, whose capital was at Napata on the Nile. This convert was, not improbably, a proselyte of the gate. It was disclosed to the mind of Peter, through circumstances connected with the conversion of Cornelius, a Roman centurion, and a few of his friends,² that the gospel might be a means of salvation for Gentiles as well as for the circumcised ; and in this proceeding of the Apostle the brethren at Jeru-

Appointment
of deacons ;
martyrdom of
Stephen.

Conversion of
heathen.

Converts in
Samaria ;
Acts viii.
5-25.

Conversion of
the eunuch ;
Acts viii.
26-39.

¹ Acts v. 17-41.

² Acts x

saalem, after requiring an explanation, acquiesced.¹ Other Hellenistic disciples of Cyprus and Cyrene preached with much success to the "Grecians"—that is, the heathen. In Antioch in Syria a nucleus was established for this class of disciples, and Barnabas, himself a native of Cyprus, and a person of consideration in the Church at Jerusalem, was sent there to look after this new movement.²

The most memorable event in relation to the carrying of the gospel beyond the lines of Judaism was the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, or Paul, a name which he probably adopted as a Roman citizen. He belonged to a Jewish family, although his father was possessed of the rights of Roman citizenship. Tarsus was a cultivated city and a prominent seat of Stoic philosophy; yet Paul's training was exclusively Jewish.³ A scrap here or there from a heathen author, which had probably become a current saying, does not indicate that he had read the classical writers. He was brought up as a rigid Pharisee, and sent to Jerusalem, where he had a married sister, to be trained in the school of Gamaliel for the office of rabbi. He had learned the trade of a tent-maker, on which he depended for support. He was an approving spectator of the slaying of Stephen,⁴ and enlisted with fanatical industry in the work of persecuting the disciples. It was while engaged in this cruel business, in the full assurance that it was a religious and meritorious work, that, on the road to Damascus, it pleased God "to reveal his Son" to him that he "might preach him among the heathen."⁵ The next three years he spent in Arabia,⁶ whether passing the time mostly in active labors, or chiefly in retirement, we have no means of knowing. He returned to Damascus, then governed by the Arabian king, Aretas; but the hostility of the Jews compelled him to fly from that city.⁷ Then followed (38 A.D.) a visit of fourteen days to Peter at Jerusalem, where Paul also met James the brother of the Lord.⁸ After a sojourn at Tarsus he repaired to Antioch (43 A.D.), at the solicitation of Barnabas,⁹ to lend his help in the work which was going forward there in connection with the fast-growing Gentile Church. About this time (44 A.D.) occurred the martyrdom of James, the brother of John, who was killed by the order of Herod Agrippa,¹⁰ from whose hands Peter,

¹ Acts xi. 1-18.

² Acts xi. 22.

³ Philip. iii. 5; Gal. i. 13, 14; Acts xxii. 3; xxiii. 6.

⁴ Acts vii. 58; viii. 1.

⁵ Gal. i. 16; Acts ix. 1 sq.; xxii. 6 sq.

⁶ Gal. i. 17.

⁷ Gal. i. 17-19; 2 Cor. xi. 33; Acts ix. 23 sq.

⁸ Gal. i. 19.

⁹ Acts ix. 30; xi. 25-26.

¹⁰ Acts xii. 2.

who had been imprisoned by him, was delivered. Thenceforward James, the Lord's brother—not one of the twelve, but having virtually the standing of an Apostle—takes the lead in the affairs of the Jerusalem Church.

The strength and zeal of the Antioch Christian society are shown in the sending forth of Paul and Barnabas, with Mark, a cousin of Barnabas, for their companion for a part of the way, on a preaching tour¹ in the eastern districts of Asia Minor. First they visited Cyprus, where Sergius Paulus, the proconsul, was converted. Thence they sailed to the mouth of the Cestrus, on the coast of Pamphylia, near Perga; from Perga they proceeded to Antioch in Pisidia, and from there eastward to Iconium, and as far as Lystra and Derbe in Lycaonia. Retracing their steps, they came back to Attalia, and sailed directly to Antioch. Wherever the missionaries went a commotion was excited. The hostility of the Jews was stirred up, especially by the Apostles' offer of salvation, through the gospel, to the Gentiles. In some places the heathen were persuaded by the Jews to join in the assaults made on the preachers. But numerous converts were won and churches were organized. This was the first incursion of Paul into the domain of heathenism.

The third visit of Paul to Jerusalem—a second visit had taken place to carry alms to the Judean brethren²—was an event of momentous importance in the development of the Church and in the history of Christianity. It was necessary that the Antioch teachers should come to an understanding with the Apostles and the Church at Jerusalem respecting the heathen converts and their relation to the Mosaic law. That the Messiah's kingdom was to comprehend the Gentiles was assumed on all hands. But the heathen converts were multiplying. Meantime there had been an accession of members to the Jerusalem Church, among whom were converted Pharisees,³ who carried into the Christian society a stubborn attachment to the legal observances. What was the meaning of the Old Testament promises, what was to become of Jewish precedence in the Messiah's kingdom, what was the use in being a Jew if the heathen were to come in without first becoming Israelites in the manner ordained by the law of Moses? By no definite teaching had Jesus explained what shape the new kingdom was to take. He had himself observed, not in a servile spirit, yet faithfully, the ceremonies prescribed in the law. His

First missionary journey of Paul.

The conference at Jerusalem, 52 A.D.

¹ Acts xiii. 1–xiv. 28.

² Acts xi. 29, 30.

³ Acts xv. 5.

personal labors had been among "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." What he said of the spiritual nature of religion, of the folly of placing merit in external rites, of himself as superior to the Sabbath and the temple, of the higher type of worship that he had come to introduce, of faith in him as the one thing essential, contained the seeds of the destruction of the Jewish ceremonial system. Through his death and his rising to a heavenly life and a spiritual throne, its office was fulfilled. It was historically undermined; but it was left to time, under the enlightening influence of the Spirit and of the lessons of Providence, to effect its downfall.

More resolutely than any other, Paul insisted on the free and universal nature of the gospel. He, like the Apostles at Jerusalem, first carried the good tidings to his own countrymen. But when, in the places which he visited, they met the call to believe in Jesus with a scornful rejection, he turned to the Gentiles, by whom the gospel was welcomed. The offer of salvation to them was not to be loaded with the condition that they should take on them the yoke of the law, and by circumcision enter within the fold of Judaism. Cornelius and other individuals had been recognized as brethren without submission to this rite; but they were few in number, and the circumstances were peculiar. It was another question when whole communities were springing up, in which the characteristic rites were not required to be observed. That there should be perplexity and hesitation among the Jewish Christians, who hoped for the conversion of their countrymen as a body, was natural. There were symptoms of a grave conflict.

The threatened division was averted. Paul and Barnabas had first a private conference on the subject with the Apostles,¹ and then met the Jerusalem Church as a body.² The Jerusalem leaders, Peter, James, and John, had no fault to find with Paul's teaching.³ When they saw what success had attended him, they gave to him and his associate the right hand of fellowship, and bade them God-speed. The great argument for catholicity, be it observed, was the same as that which had convinced Peter in the affair of Cornelius. It was plain that the Spirit of God had followed the preaching of Paul: the good fruits were apparent. No dogmatic theory could stand in the way of such unanswerable facts. The verdict of Heaven had been given. The reason then assigned for fellowship with Paul is a motive to catholicity, and a standing rebuke of narrowness, for all time. The

Paul and the
Three.

¹ Gal. ii. 2 sq.

² Acts xv. 4-29.

³ Gal. ii. 6.

demand of judaizers that Titus, one of Paul's companions, who was of Greek parentage, should be circumcised, the Apostle absolutely refused to comply with. The case of Timothy, whose mother was a Jewess, was different. In this case, which occurred later, no principle was at stake: the rights of Gentile believers were not involved. In the conference of the Antioch teachers with the Jerusalem Church, Peter—as might be expected, in view of the light which he had previously received—spoke on the side of freedom. James followed with an approval of what he had said, quoting in support of Peter's opinion a passage from the prophet Amos. It was not well, he added, to "trouble" the Gentile converts. It was enough to enjoin on them abstinence from the flesh of animals which had been sacrificed to heathen gods, from blood, the life of the animal, held sacred in the Mosaic system, from animals slain with the blood left in them, and from fornication. If this moral offence does not refer to incestuous marriages, the mention of it in so brief a catalogue of things forbidden indicates how prevalent and how little condemned the sin of impurity was among the heathen. There was nothing in these recommendations at variance with Paul's ideas, or which he would regard as an abridgment of the freedom demanded for his converts. It is improbable that James would have been satisfied if anything less had been required. That he *was* satisfied Paul himself declares. The reason assigned by James for these restrictions, that the Old Testament law was always read in the synagogues, may signify that *Jewish* Christians would be in no danger of forgetting its requirements. It is more commonly understood, however, to mean that if the Gentile converts failed to abstain from the obnoxious practices, a bitter prejudice would be excited against them among all persons of Jewish birth, and a barrier to intercourse between the two classes would be erected. In writing to the Galatians and to the Corinthians, Paul makes no reference to this decision at the conference. Among the Galatians it was his right to be an Apostle that was disputed, and on this point he does refer to the fellowship accorded to him at Jerusalem. Among the Corinthians, in the dispute about the eating of meat offered to idols, neither Jews nor judaizers were concerned. Besides, it is not likely that Paul regarded the act of the conference, in itself considered, as applicable to Gentile churches which, at a later time, he had planted independently. There is, however, no evidence of an opposition on his part, at any period, to its essential purport. Certainly, while defending the liberty of the Gentiles, he was at pains not to scan-

dalize the Jews. "With the Jews," he said, "I became as a Jew." The message of fraternal recognition from the Church at Jerusalem was sent to the Gentile converts in Syria and the neighboring district of Cilicia. There was rejoicing at Antioch, where believers in Jesus had first been called "Christians."

The judaizers were quelled by the prevailing temper of tolerance in the "pillar" Apostles and their Jewish Christian followers.

The judaizers: the controversy at Antioch. But the extreme party was far from being extirpated. They continued to dog the steps of Paul, and to foment suspicion against him among Christians of Jewish extraction. They went so far as to deny his claim to be an Apostle, as he was not one of the twelve. The Apostle to the Gentiles had a life-long conflict to wage with this busy, implacable faction. At the same time, by the Jews who were not converts to Christianity, he was pursued with malignant hate as an apostate from the religion of Moses. Independently of the points contended for by the judaizers, there were questions really left unsettled by the Jerusalem conference. Controversy broke out anew at Antioch.¹ There the Jewish Christians, and with them Peter, at a time when he was sojourning at Antioch, sat down at the *agapæ*, or love-feasts, with their Gentile brethren. Persons of influence from Jerusalem, who came, on what errand we know not, from James, appear to have regarded the agreement at the conference as not a sufficient warrant for this sort of intercourse, and objected to it; so that even Barnabas and Peter stayed away from these Christian gatherings at a common table. This vacillation on the part of Peter called out an indignant remonstrance from Paul. He complained, not that Peter adopted a too narrow construction of the Jerusalem settlement, but that he was now, merely out of fear, departing from his real conviction, and by thus changing his course was in effect saying to the Gentile converts that they ought to come under the law. From this subjection the Jerusalem conference had declared them free.

Justification by faith alone. From the beginning to the end of his career, *righteousness* was the ideal which Paul kept in view. The crisis in his religious life was in the appalling discovery that his conception of righteous character was superficial, and that when tried by law he was self-condemned. On the legal path there was no deliverance for him. This could only come by the unmerited bestowal of forgiveness through Christ. Receiving Christ as a

¹ Gal. ii. 11-14.

Saviour in faith, he was conscious of being lifted to the plane of filial communion with God. The faith-method of salvation was in absolute contrast with the law-method. To mingle this last with the one gospel requirement to believe in Christ, was to call in question the adequacy of the work of redemption, and it was equivalent to making man partly his own saviour. These thoughts Paul utters, with a force that springs from the deepest conviction, in the comments that he makes on the controversy with Peter.¹ They underlie his epistles, notably those to the Galatians and to the Romans. In the Epistle to the Galatians, and in the later Epistle to the Colossians, Paul goes so far in the combat with judaizers as to call the Mosaic ordinances the "rudiments," or a part of the rudimentary stage of religion. They were adapted to the period of childhood and were a species of "bondage." The disuse of the Mosaic ritual among Jewish Christians would naturally follow as a logical consequence from the relinquishment of the hope of converting the Jews as a body. The Epistle to the Hebrews, which is held by most critics to have been written by a Pauline disciple, aims to persuade Jewish believers to give up the old rites on the ground that they are typical of realities by which they have been supplanted.

The outcome of the interview of Paul with the other Apostles, in connection with the more public conference, was an amicable division of labor. He was to go to the heathen; Peter was to go to the Jews. It was not a partition of territory: it was an ethnographic, not a geographic, arrangement. Among his countrymen, the success of Peter, we are told, had been parallel with that of Paul beyond the Jewish pale. But about the earlier, as well as the later, missionary career of Peter, we have scanty information, for the reason that Luke, in the Acts, gives his principal attention to the labors of the Apostle to the Gentiles. This was natural, considering that Luke was himself a Gentile, was writing specially to instruct Gentiles, and was for a time a personal attendant of Paul. He will describe how the heathen attained to the privileges of the gospel. We find Peter writing an epistle from Babylon, where the Jews were numerous. He addresses the Gentile believers in Asia Minor, calling them "the Dispersion"—the Diaspora—the old, familiar designation of the Israelites residing abroad. There is no doubt that a long history of travel, and exertion, and suffering, on the part of the Apostle to the Jews was left

The career of
Peter.

¹ Gal. ii. 15-21.

unrecorded. The tradition that Peter at last suffered martyrdom at Rome, under Nero, is probably entitled to credit. It is of earlier origin than the unfounded legends respecting his particular relation to the Roman Church.

Our knowledge of the Apostle Paul's missionary life is far from being complete. We have only a brief sketch of journeys and toils that extended over a period of thirty years. Large spaces are passed over in silence. For example, in the

The career
of Paul.

catalogue of his sufferings, incidentally given,¹ he refers to the fact that he had been shipwrecked three times, and these disasters were all prior to the shipwreck on the island of Malta described by Luke.² Shortly after the conference at Jerusalem he started on his second missionary tour. He was accompanied by Silas, and was

Paul's second
missionary
journey,
52 A.D.

joined by Timothy at Lystra. He revisited his converts in Eastern Asia Minor, founded churches in Galatia and Phrygia, and from Troas, obedient to a heavenly summons, crossed over to Europe. Having planted at Philippi a church that remained remarkably devoted and loyal to him, he followed the great Roman road to Thessalonica, the most important city in Macedonia. Driven from there and from Berea, he proceeded to Athens.

In that renowned and cultivated city he discoursed on Mars Hill to auditors eager for new ideas in philosophy and religion, and in private debated with Stoics and Epicureans.³ At Corinth, which had risen from its ruins and was once more rich and prosperous, he remained for a year and a half. It was there, probably, that he wrote his two Epistles to the Thessalonian Christians. After a short stay at Ephesus he returned to Antioch by way of Cesarea and Jerusalem. It was not long before Paul—a second Alexander, but on a

Paul's third
missionary
journey,
55 A.D.

peaceful expedition—began his third great missionary journey. Taking the land route from Antioch, he traversed Asia Minor to Ephesus, a flourishing commercial mart, the capital of the Roman province of Asia. There, with occasional absences, he made his abode for upwards of two years. From Ephesus, probably, he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. The malignant and partially successful efforts of judaizers to prevail on his Galatian converts, who were of Celtic lineage, to adopt the Mosaic ceremonies, together with the judaizing assault on his title to be considered an Apostle, called out from him the sharpest denunciation that we have from his pen of these conspirators against Christian liberty. From Ephesus Paul also wrote the First

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 23-29.

² Acts xxvii.

³ Acts xvii. 18, 21.

Epistle to the Corinthians. The Second Epistle to the Corinthians he probably wrote from Philippi. Parties had sprung up among them. One party professed to look to Paul as its head ; another preferred to follow Apollos, the eloquent Alexandrian convert, who had been instructed by Aquila and Priscilla, the friends of Paul ; a third named themselves after Peter, but appear not to have attacked the teaching of the Apostle to the Gentiles, or to have preached to the heathen disciples the necessity of circumcision ; a fourth, "the Christ party," would seem to have been judaizing in its character, and to have proposed to confine their allegiance to the original Apostles appointed by Jesus. Paul rebuked the sectarian spirit, protested against party names, and reminded the Corinthian believers that their teachers, one and all, were only servants of Christ and of the flock. Coming down through Greece, he remained there three months. There he composed his Epistle to the Romans. At Rome there was less of judaizing rancor, and his tone is milder than in writing to the Galatians.

The untiring Apostle now turned his face towards Jerusalem. He desired to be present at the festival of the Pentecost. In order to save time, he sailed past Ephesus, and at Miletus bade a tender farewell to the Ephesian elders. He had fulfilled his pledge given at the conference, and he now carried contributions from the Christians of Macedonia and Achaia for the poor at Jerusalem. Yet he was not wholly without misgivings as to the reception that would be accorded to him even by the brethren there.¹ From the unbelieving Jews he could expect nothing but venomous hostility and outbreakings of violence. He found, indeed, that the Jewish Christians, gathered in great numbers at the festival, had been told by Jews and judaizers that he was an active opponent of the legal observances, even when practised by believers of Jewish birth. As at the earlier conference, James and the elders were cordial in their feeling and expressions. James looked on the act of the conference as a settlement in relation to the Gentile converts everywhere. His prudent device for convincing the misinformed and prejudiced that Paul was not waging a war against Moses, failed of its full effect, owing to a false rumor that Paul had taken Trophimus, a heathen convert from Ephesus, within the sacred walls of the temple. The Apostle was rescued by a detachment of the Roman garrison from a mob of Jewish malignants, was held in custody for two years at Cesarea, and was finally enabled

Paul at Jerusalem.

¹ Rom. xv. 31, 32.

to accomplish a long-cherished intention to go to Rome, by being conveyed there as a prisoner, he having made an appeal to Cæsar. After being wrecked on the Mediterranean and cast ashore on the island of Malta, under the circumstances related in Luke's graphic and accurate description of the voyage,¹ he went on his way in

safety to the capital. There he was under the surveillance of the Prætorian guard, but was allowed to receive in his own hired apartments those who wished to see him. He counted among his converts some of "Cæsar's household." Of the circumstances of the forming of the Church at Rome we have no knowledge. That Paul, neither in his Epistle to the Romans nor in the Epistle to the Philippians written from Rome, makes mention of Peter, shows that the legend which ascribes its foundation to him is a fiction. This has been admitted even by noted Roman Catholic scholars. It is possible that Jews, converted at Pentecost, or driven from Jerusalem on the occasion of the first persecution, found their way to the capital and formed the nucleus of the Church there. It comprised both Jewish and Gentile Christians. Among them there were judaizing adversaries, but the body of the Jewish believers in the Roman Church regarded Paul with sympathy and respect. At Rome, during this period, were written the Epistles to the Ephesians, to the Colossians, to the Philippians, and to Philemon. The Pastoral Epistles—I. and II. Timothy and Titus—imply a release from imprisonment. In the interval before his second imprisonment, he appears to have gone to Macedonia and to have twice visited Asia Minor; and it is not improbable that he journeyed as far West as Spain. This second imprisonment was

brought to an end by his martyrdom. He was put to death near the close of Nero's reign. Being a Roman citizen, we may assume that he was beheaded—probably outside of the gate, upon the road leading to Ostia. No man living in that age stands on so high a plane, intellectually and morally, as the Apostle Paul. No fact in the history of that period is more sublime than the unfaltering constancy of his faith. In how many of the great cities of the Roman world, forming, as it were, a chain from Antioch to Rome, had he planted churches, which were organized, were in communication with one another, and by their charitable collections, if in no other way, in connection with the Mother Church in Jerusalem! An historian has adverted to the fact that shortly after "his noble head fell under the executioner's

¹ Acts xxvii.

sword," the great temples of Rome and of Jerusalem, the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, the august sanctuary of the Roman people, and the temple on Mount Zion, were destroyed by fire—as if to signalize the death of the hero of the faith, who had smitten with a fatal blow the stupendous fabrics of Gentile and Jewish worship.

As long as Christians were confounded with the Jews, it was only from the Jews, who alone understood the difference, that they had to fear persecution. It was natural that the heathen at the outset should look on Christians as nothing more than a Jewish party. It was in the Jewish synagogues that the Christian preachers appeared. They were designated as "Jews" at Philippi¹ by those who did not like to lose the profits which they had reaped through a female diviner. The Proconsul Gallio would not hear an accusation which he naturally supposed to relate to points of Jewish theology.² At Ephesus the Jews brought forward Alexander, one of their own number, to make it clear that they had no concern in the new preaching, which exposed them to attack.³ Generally, in the book of Acts, the Romans appear as upholders of order, protecting the Apostles of the new faith from the violence of Jewish fanatics. But this advantage was lost the moment Christianity was distinctly seen by the Roman authorities and by

the heathen populace to be a religion separate from Judaism. Then it no longer stood under the shield that was extended over a national system of worship. It was an illegal religion. Moreover, the attempt to make proselytes, the organization of fraternities, and the holding of unlicensed meetings, were special offences against Roman law. The animosity of the common people was roused on account of their superstitious devotion to the old divinities, their idea that the gods were incensed by the desertion of the heathen altars and hence inflicted terrific calamities, such as famine and pestilence, and their general antipathy to the ways of the Christians. The withdrawal of these from employments and diversions which involved in some form either a countenance of heathen worship or of some species of immorality, exposed them to the charge of being unsocial. The absence of any images in their worship suggested the charge of atheism. The entire crusade of the Christians, peaceful though it was, against the spirit of the world, and their unrelenting demand of repentance and regeneration, could not fail to give rise to virulent opposition. As far as

Persecution at first by Jews.

Persecution by the heathen.

¹ Acts xvi. 20.

² Acts xviii. 15, 17.

³ Acts xix. 33.

the persecution of the Church by Roman rulers is concerned, the motive was not religious zeal or intolerance. In the first century the cruelties of Nero and Domitian sprung from personal spite or selfish interest. Afterwards the chief incentive was political — the desire to suppress a religion that was held to be contrary to law and divisive in its influence. As Mommsen explains, the laws excluding the new religion, as those excluding robbery or any other crime, were always on the statute-book. To what degree they should be enforced was dependent on the will of the local tribunals, or on the prompting, whether it were harsh or gentle, of the central authority at Rome. The same historian thinks that it was made the special business of the chief priest in each province to see that the arrangements for emperor-worship, and other religious obligations, should be carried out.

The first marked instance of heathen enmity on record was the persecution under Nero. It is described by the Roman historian Tacitus.¹ From his account we see that the Christians were then well known as a distinct sect. Nero, who was justly detested for his brutal tyranny, in order to avert from himself what was, perhaps, a groundless suspicion of having set Rome on fire, accused the Christians of having kindled the flames which had laid in ashes a great part of the city. "A vast multitude were convicted," writes Tacitus, "not so much on the charge of making the conflagration, as of hating the human race. And in their deaths they were made the subjects of sport, for they were covered with the hides of wild beasts, and worried to death by dogs, or nailed to crosses, or set fire to, and when day declined were burned to serve for nocturnal lights. Nero had offered his own gardens for this exhibition, and, also, exhibited a game of the circus, sometimes mingling in the crowd in the dress of a charioteer, sometimes standing in his chariot." Tacitus adds that at last compassion was felt for the victims of Nero's ferocity, culpable though they were deemed to be. As to other cruelties which Christians may have suffered in the provinces at about this time, we have no authentic information.

The dread and horror inspired by Nero, the fact of his death by his own hand—the last of the Cæsarean family—at the early age of thirty, and of his entombment in a private sepulchre, engendered a rumor that he had not really perished. Among Christians it took the form that he had retired beyond the Euphrates, and would reappear in the character of

Persecution by
Nero. 64 A.D.

38 A.D.

¹ Annal xv. 44.

Antichrist, to finish the destruction of Rome, the mystic Babylon, an event to be followed immediately by the second coming of Christ. The appearance of a number of pretenders to the name and station of the vanished emperor, fostered this belief. Long after all doubt respecting Nero's death was dispelled, the idea that he would revisit the earth, as the detestable forerunner of the Lord's advent, still lingered in the Church.

At the time of Paul's death, the great Jewish war—the result of which was the capture of Jerusalem by Titus—had already begun.

The Jewish war, 66 A.D. The growing fanaticism of the Jews broke out against the Christians, who did not sympathize with their determination to revolt. James, the Lord's brother, was put to death (62 A.D.). As to the circumstances of his murder the traditions vary. They describe him as a model of righteousness, an ascetic, obeying the Nazarite rule, and as frequently on his knees in the temple.

Removal of John and others to Asia Minor, c. 67 A.D. Not far from the beginning of the war the Apostle John transferred himself to Asia Minor. He took up his abode at Ephesus, where he lived to an advanced age and died near the close of the century. Besides John, others prominent in the Church joined in this migration. The Apostle Philip spent his last days at Hieropolis, in Phrygia, where he lived with his daughters. At least two other disciples of Jesus—John, “the Presbyter,” and Aristion, are known to have lived in this region. The canonical book of Revelation was composed under the impressions produced either by the Neronian persecution, or by other cruelties of a like character. Its authorship is ascribed by the ancient ecclesiastical tradition to John the Apostle. Near the close of his life, “the Disciple whom Jesus loved” wrote the Gospel and the Epistles which bear his name. Among the legends pertaining to his last years is the story of his courage and kindness in the reclaiming of a robber whom he had once baptized. It is related that when too old to stand he was wont to sit in a chair and to reiterate before the Christian flock the simple words, “Little children, love one another.” Authentic reminiscences of his benign influence, and traces of his activity long remained among the churches and the teachers of the gospel in the district of which Ephesus was the centre.

The fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple by a firebrand thrown into it by a soldier of Titus, were a death-blow to judaizing, and even to Jewish Christianity.

Fall of Jerusalem; revolt of Bar-cochab.

It is not certain that the rites of Jewish worship were permitted in Jerusalem after its capture by Titus. It is certain that

after the fierce uprising under Bar-cohab, a pretended Messiah, in the time of Hadrian (135), which was crushed with tremendous slaughter, the old rites were wholly excluded from that city. The enmity of the bulk of the Jews to the Christian faith, and the verdict uttered against them as a nation, through appalling acts of Providence, extinguished all hope of a triumph of the new kingdom under Judaic auspices, and with it the main support of the Mosaic rites as practised in the Church. The rapid progress of the Church among the Gentiles conduced to the same result. The Gospel and the Epistles of John are as catholic in their tone as are the writings of Paul. Judaic Christianity was a thing outgrown. The religion of Jesus had broken the chain of bondage to the Old Testament system. Thenceforward, such as clung to the observances of the law more and more sink into the position of heretical parties, tenacious of life, but isolated and destined to extinction.

Among the many unfounded legends respecting the labors of the Apostles is the tale that it was determined by lot among them to what countries they should go, and that the Apostles were divided for this purpose into three groups. Ancient, but untrustworthy, traditions represent Andrew as preaching in Scythia, Thomas in Parthia, and, according to later accounts, in India, and Mark as the founder of the Church in Alexandria. The ambition to trace national churches back to the apostolic age accounts for the claim of the Spaniards that James, the brother of John, preached in Spain, and that his body was transported to that country and was buried at Compostella; of the French, that, among others, Dionysius the Areopagite, and Lazarus planted the gospel in their land; of the English, that Simon Zelotes, Joseph of Arimathea, and even Paul, labored in Britain, etc. The truth is that the lives of most of the Apostles, as well as the circumstances of their death, are involved in the deepest obscurity.

There was an early tradition, which is not incredible, that the Emperor Domitian had ordered the descendants of David to be slain; that the grandchildren of Judas, the brother of Jesus, were brought before him; but that finding that they were poor, harmless rustics, expecting no earthly kingdom, he dismissed them with contempt. Toward the close of his reign Domitian subjected the Christians at Rome to savage persecution. His naturally morose and jealous temper was further soured by military reverses. He took up the charge of atheism, which was beginning to be made against Christians as well as Jews.

Persecution
by Domitian,
c. 95 A.D.

Fate of juda-
izing and
Jewish
Christianity.

Legends of
the Apostles.

Among the converts who perished was Flavius Clement, the emperor's cousin. This martyr's wife, Flavia Domitilla, was banished. A cemetery of "Domitilla," one of the early burial-places of Christians, was not unlikely her gift to her Christian brethren. Other Christians were put to death, some were banished, and the property of others was confiscated.

When we take into view the results of the preaching of the Apostles we see that great things were effected. With some, at a time when miracle and mystery had a peculiar fascination, the signs and wonders wrought by the Apostles had a decisive influence. Others, like the Ethiopic proselyte at Gaza, saw how conformed to ancient prophecies was the death of Jesus on the cross. "To many whose burdens were heavy, the peace of God, which Christianity announced, brought hope in the room of hopelessness, strength where there was weakness, an attractive influence that lifted them above all misgivings and difficulties, even under the scoffs of philosophers. Intercourse with kindly Christians and glimpses of their quiet domestic virtues, mingled as these were with the courage with which a man like Paul bade defiance to danger, aroused the yearning for God which Christ had implied would appear when the disciples should let their light shine before men. The great proclamation of the gospel and the powerful religious awakening everywhere consequent, produced the most extraordinary commotion." At Jerusalem, as we have seen, thousands at one time embraced the gospel. At Antioch, in Pisidia, almost the whole population were drawn together to hear Paul. At Ephesus, Jewish and Greek magicians cast their books into the fire. Hostile Jews—exorcists—used the name of Jesus to conjure with. Silversmiths who made shrines of Diana were afraid that their business would be gone. The goddess was in danger of being deserted by her votaries. The churches at Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome were very large. The Church at Jerusalem comprised thousands of members. At Rome, Tacitus informs us, the Christians were a great multitude. The cry at Thessalonica was that the Apostles had turned the world upside down. Paul could say that the gospel had been preached to every creature, and was in all the world bearing fruit.¹ The Apocalypse indicates that the number of converts was very great.² If they were generally from the ranks of the

¹ Col. i. 23, 6.

² Rev. vii. 4-9; xiv. 1, 4.

poor and the suffering, this was not uniformly the fact. Among them were persons who belonged to the imperial household. In the Church there were women of wealth and social position, as Lydia in Philippi, and even Domitilla, the kinswoman of Domitian. There were also men of distinction. "Such were Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus; Publius, the Roman ruler in Malta; Flavius Clement, who had held the office of consul at Rome; the Asiarchs, or chief officers of Asia, at Ephesus;¹ Dionysius, a member of the Council of Areopagus at Athens; Erastus, the public treasurer at Corinth; the centurion Cornelius, at Cæsarea; Luke, the physician, and Theophilus, to whom he addressed his writings; Crispus, ruler of the Jewish synagogue at Corinth; and, among the Jews, members of the Sanhedrim, Pharisees, and priests."

The basis of ecclesiastical organization was the fraternal equality of believers. "All ye are brethren."² Instead of a sacerdotal

order there was a universal priesthood.³ Jesus had spoken of "the Church," in a sense answering to the

"congregation" of Israel, a conception familiar to Old Testament readers. Of this Church he was to be the builder.

Complaints on the part of one disciple against another were to be carried to "the Church," the body of disciples, with the Apostles at their head. His injunctions to the Apostles to superintend the flock, and the rites of baptism and of the Lord's supper, imply definite association. The synagogue naturally served as a model in the organization of churches. They are even called by that name in the Epistle of James.⁴ This was their character at the outset.

Yet the first office created, that of deacons, sprung out of the special

needs of the Church at Jerusalem, there being no office just like it in the synagogue. The organization of the

Gentile brotherhoods was gradual. In writing to Corinth, Paul does not distinctly refer to officers as existing there; yet

he speaks of those called of God to help and to govern.⁵ At first the deacons had it for their business to see to the poor. Luke gives no account of the institution of the eldership, perhaps because this same office was a well-known feature in the Jewish synagogues. In the Church, as in the synagogue, the elders or presbyters were equal in rank, although one of the "rulers of the synagogue" among the

¹ Acts xix. 31.

² Matt. xxiii. 8.

³ 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

⁴ James ii. 2 (Revised Version).

⁵ 1 Cor. xii. 28.

The origin of Church organization.

The diaconate, and the eldership.

Jews may have sometimes acted as president of the board. In the Gentile churches, the presbyters are also called "bishops," the translation of a Greek word meaning "overseers." The two words are applied in the New Testament to the same officers indiscriminately. The word *bishop*, or "overseer," was familiar in this sense to readers of the Old Testament in the Septuagint version. Both terms, "presbyter" and "bishop," appear to have been in use in Syria and Asia Minor to designate officers of municipal and of private corporations. What influence was exerted from this use of the terms, and from the Gentile example of similar offices, remains to be determined. The work of the council of elders in all the churches was primarily to superintend religious worship, and in part to watch over the temporal well-being of the brotherhood. They were first chosen "to rule," not to teach; yet the ability to teach was soon deemed an important qualification, and became both an essential and a leading function of the office.¹

The capacity to hold office, or to minister in whatever way to the spiritual upbuilding of the Church, was regarded as a gift of the Spirit—a *charisma*. Of course, the designation to these varied ministries accorded with the natural talents and aptitudes of the individuals thus selected and empowered by the Holy Spirit. As far as spiritual quickening and instruction were concerned, they comprised the gift of tongues, a form of ecstatic, unintelligible utterance, which those possessed of a gift of interpretation explained; the gift of prophecy, or of fervent speech, which deeply moved the auditors, whether believers already, or heathen who came into the meetings; the gift of discerning spirits, or of judging whether the addresses made came from a true and divine source; and the gift of teaching, or of discoursing in a more quiet and connected style. Those perceived to be endowed with this last gift were recognized as "teachers," and formed a class called by this name. "Evangelists" were missionaries, deputies of the Apostles, selected by them to assist in their missionary work. Timothy, Titus, Silas, and others belonged to this class. The elders and deacons in the several churches were chosen by the body of disciples. There was but one organization within the limits of a town. The church "in the house" of this or that individual was simply a religious meeting held there as a matter of convenience, the term "church" being used in its ordinary sense of "assembly." The connection of the churches

Officers, and
how ap-
pointed.

The churches
municipal:
their connec-
tion.

¹ Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24; 1 Tim. iii. 2; 2 Tim. ii. 24.

was not organic. They were bound together only by ties of sympathy, save that they acknowledged in common the supervision of the Apostles. To the Apostles had been given the power of the keys and the power of binding and loosing, that is, the authority to exercise Christian discipline, and a legislative or judicial function in connection with the planting of the gospel. Yet at Corinth it is the Church as a body, acting under the monition of the Apostle, that excommunicates an unworthy member.¹ Influential in promoting mutual knowledge and a spirit of union among the scattered Christian societies, were the journeys of the Apostles, especially of Paul, their letters, which were sometimes sent from one church to another,² the journeys of apostolic helpers and of other Christians, almsgiving, and the liberal exercise of hospitality.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE : CHRISTIAN WORSHIP : CHRISTIAN TEACHING.

ACCORDING to the picture given us by Luke of the Church at Jerusalem, it was at the beginning like a family. Yet the surrender of goods into the common treasury was purely voluntary. It was neither universal on the part of the members nor was it a permanent custom.³ It was a part of the first outpouring of brotherly love among the followers of the risen Jesus. Galilean disciples who remained at Jerusalem may have sold their possessions at home and offered the proceeds as a gift to the brotherhood. Such a practice could not continue. The Church was not to supplant, but to sanctify, natural relations, such as give rise to individual ownership and underlie the family and the state. Yet this example of giving up private property, coupled with the going forth of the Apostles without wallet or gold or silver, had great effect in after ages, when the desire sprung up for a literal imitation of the first disciples.

In addition to the ordinary Jewish worship at the stated hours in the temple, the disciples met daily in groups at private houses.

In these meetings they sat at the table together, and partook of a common meal, the *agape*, or love-feast. At the close of this repast, whoever presided handed round the bread and wine, as Jesus had done at the Last Supper. This was the primitive form of the sacrament. As time went on, the Jewish

The Church at Jerusalem : the common treasury.

Religious meetings : the love-feast.

¹ 1 Cor. v. 3-5.

² Col. iv. 16.

³ Acts v. 4; vi. 1; xii 12.

Christians manifested a steadfast spirit in enduring persecution, which is praised by the Apostle Paul.¹ A spirit of forgiveness, which was not a native quality of their race, a spirit that appeared in the dying intercession of Stephen, was one of the effects of the gospel.

The Master on the cross had prayed for his enemies. In the Gentile churches the contrast between the Christians and the world about them was of necessity more marked. They had more to cast off, for the heathen religious system mingled itself, in one form or another, in very many of the occupations and amusements of life. The striking reformation of morals among the heathen converts is brought to our notice in various passages of the apostolic epistles.² Especially was this change remarkable in respect to chastity; for licentiousness was a prevailing vice of heathen society. Domestic purity took the place of sensual indulgence, and of that laxness of the marriage tie which made divorces an every-day occurrence. Woman was raised to be a companion of man, instead of an instrument of his passions and a victim of his tyranny. The Gentile converts had their peculiar faults. The appetites were not at once stripped of their power.³ Christian principle might give way in the conflict with the seductions of sense. On the other hand, a fondness for speculation, and with it a pride of intellect and an arrogant feeling toward those inferior in talents, were Greek vices that occasionally reasserted themselves within the Christian fold.⁴ Women in some of the churches manifested a love of finery and of display,⁵ and at Corinth, with their newly gained sense of equality, overstepped the bounds of modesty and reserve prescribed by ancient sentiment.⁶ Disorders arose there which, had they been allowed to spread, instead of being checked as they were by the energetic remonstrances of Paul, would have brought the Christian societies into disrepute and have broken them up. Paul had occasion to discourage, as unchristian and scandalous, litigation before the heathen tribunals, and to recommend in such cases arbitration within the Church, or even the patient endurance of wrong. The powerful reaction against worldliness, and the deep corruption of morals, engendered in some an ascetic spirit. At Corinth there appear to have been two parties on the subject of marriage—one that insisted on it, and another that abjured it altogether. Here Paul took a middle ground, ex-

Character of
the Gentile
Christians.

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 14 sq.

² Eph. iv. 17 sq.; v. 8; 1 Cor. vi. 9-11.

³ 1 Cor. v. 1 sq.; Tit. i. 10-14.

⁴ Epp. to the Corinthians; Rom. xiv. 1 sq.

⁵ 1 Tim. ii. 9; 1 Pet. iii. 3.

⁶ 1 Cor. xi. 2-17; xiv. 34; 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

pressing his personal preference for the unmarried state.¹ The counsel that he gave was based on "the present distress," which made it expedient for every one to remain as he was. It is remarkable that as regards this counsel, which is founded apparently on the expected nearness of the Lord's Advent, or Parousia, the Apostle disclaims the authority of inspiration. It is given as a private judgment of his own. The authority of the civil magistrate was asserted by Jesus and by the Apostles.² They affirmed the divine origin of government and the binding force of human law whenever it did not clash with the commandments of God. Paul availed himself of his privileges as a Roman citizen.³ Prayers were offered up for rulers who were inflicting cruel persecution. Nevertheless, injunctions to abstain from teaching the gospel, and commands to pay religious honors to the emperor, were disobeyed. A higher law, an authority exalted above that of the state, was thus recognized.⁴ In this promulgation of the rights of conscience lay the germs of civil liberty. The ancient theory of the omnipotence of the state was now withstood, not by a single philosopher like Socrates, but by a multitude, most of them belonging to the humbler social class.

Wherever Christianity went, slavery existed. Slavery was not forbidden by the Christian teachers. Slaves and their masters were found together in the same churches. The ethics of the gospel as regards civil and social relations, it took time fully to develop. It was enough for the Apostles to exhort masters to be just and kind,⁵ and servants to be obedient and patient. Paul even counselled the slave who might be free to decline the boon.⁶ He sent back Onesimus, as a brother beloved, yet to become once more subject to Philemon. In the fellowship with Christ, on that plane, there was neither bond nor free, but an equality before a common Lord and Judge.⁷ At his table and at the love-feast master and slave sat side by side. It was left for the genius of Christianity to sweep away barriers and to level inequalities by a process not the less effective because it was indirect.

With the foundation of the Christian Church the reign of love

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 1-7; also, vv. 26, 31-35.

² Matt. xxii. 21; Rom. xiii. 1 sq.; Tit. iii. 1.

³ Acts xvi. 37; xxv. 11.

⁴ Acts v. 29.

⁵ Col. iv. 1; cf. 1 Tim. v. 18.

⁶ Eph. vi. 5 sq.; Col. iii. 22; 1 Tim. vi. 1; Titus ii. 9; 1 Pet. ii. 18; 1 Cor. vii. 21; Ep. to Philemon.

⁷ Gal. iii. 28; Col. iii. 22; Eph. vi. 8; Col. iv. 1.

on earth began. Kindness and charity to the poor, Jesus had inculcated by precept and example. The diaconate was instituted for their sake, and in some of the churches was committed to women as well as to men.¹ It belonged, however, to the elders to dispense the charities of the Church; the deacons and deaconesses rendered them aid in this work. Widows and orphans were specially cared for. A class of widows are spoken of as "enrolled."² They were wholly supported by the Church, and rendered special services, although they are not to be confounded with the "order" of widows which grew up in the second century. Industry and frugality are enjoined in order that the Christian may have the means of helping the needy. Church members are urged by Paul to set aside on every Sunday what they can spare for the poor.³ A selfish, niggardly spirit on the part of the rich is denounced by James.⁴ The love-feasts, where the provisions were furnished by the disciples, gave an opportunity for the more prosperous to make liberal contributions for the sustenance of poorer brethren.

The Jewish Christians at first frequented the synagogues. They continued to observe the festivals appointed in the law, and only by degrees connected with them Christian ideas and facts. They kept the Sabbath on Saturday, according to the Mosaic commandment. But, side by side with this observance, there grew up the custom of meeting for Christian worship on the first day of the week, the day of the Lord's resurrection. We find a few references to meetings on that day among Gentile Christians. In the Apocalypse it is designated as the Lord's day.⁵ In these apparently spontaneous gatherings of the first Christians, beginning with the meeting of the eleven Apostles in the upper chamber, we discern the first steps in the rise of an institution that was to supersede the weekly observance of the Old Testament, and to commemorate the world's redemption, as that had been a memorial of its creation. We have no distinct mention of any yearly festivals among the Gentile Christians. It seems probable, however, that in some churches—for example, in Asia Minor—where Jewish and Gentile converts were mingled, the Passover continued to be kept, but transformed itself into a commemoration of the closing scenes in the life of the Lord.

The meetings of Christians were held at first in private houses

¹ Rom. xvi. 1, 12.

² 1 Tim. v. 9; cf. ver. 11.

³ 1 Cor. xvi. 2.

⁴ Jas. ii. 16; v. 1 sq.

⁵ Mark xvi. 14; John xx. 19, 26; Acts xx. 7; 1 Cor. xvi. 2; Rev. i. 10.

Aquila and Priscilla, being tent-makers, had need of a large room. We find that both at Corinth and at Rome they provided a place of assembly in their house. At Ephesus, Paul held meetings in the "school of Tyrannus," which was no doubt hired for the purpose. It was either a school-house for the teaching of philosophy, or one of the numerous buildings bearing the name of *schola*, which were used for a meeting-place by religious associations among the heathen.

Worship in the apostolic age was a spontaneous expression of devout feeling. The order of worship was a free copy of the synagogue service. Selections from the Old Testament were read. Exposition of Scripture and spontaneous speaking followed. If a

letter from an Apostle had arrived, it was read to the assembly.¹ Prayer was in part the function of the leader in the service, and in part sprung from the free, momentary impulse of the worshippers present. No doubt the Lord's Prayer was repeated, and it may be that benedictions and short forms of devotion were transferred from the synagogue service; but there are no traces of a definite liturgy. The hymns were, some of them, sung by individuals, and some by the whole assembly.² Most of them were from the Psalter, but there were Christian hymns, fragments of which are found in the epistles.³

The ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion. Whether in this rite the pouring of water on the head was sometimes practised then, as it certainly was subsequently, is an open question. The first distinct reference to baptism by affusion is in the early writing called the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," written perhaps about 120, where the direction is given, in case there is not a sufficiency of water, to pour water on the head thrice. The baptism of infants is neither explicitly required nor forbidden in the New Testament. Whether this early practice can be traced as far back as the Apostles themselves, is a point on which the evidence is not so decisive as to produce a settled opinion among scholars. When Irenæus wrote (about 180), it was an established custom; but he is the first author whose recognition of it can with certainty be inferred. A ground for it was found in the words spoken by Jesus to little children,⁴ and in the idea of Paul that the offspring of a believing parent are "holy," or within the pale of God's people.⁵ The connection of the Lord's Supper

¹ Col. iv. 16; 1 Thess. v. 27.

² 1 Cor. xiv. 26; Col. iii. 16.

³ Eph. v. 14; 1 Tim. iii. 16; 1 Pet. iii. 10-12.

⁴ Matt. xix. 14.

⁵ 1 Cor. vii. 14.

with the love-feasts appears to have continued through the apostolic period.

The one article of faith at the outset was that Jesus is the Messiah. Whoever acknowledged him in this character was baptized.

Doctrinal
teaching.

But, after his death and resurrection, the ancient prophecy of a suffering Messiah, and the recollected teaching of Jesus, disclosed the meaning of these events. Enlightened by the Spirit, the Apostles saw in his death the ground of forgiveness and reconciliation. The belief in his divine sonship appears in the first three gospels, most evidently in the predicates applied to him as judge of the world. By Paul and John, his pre-existence and divinity are explicitly taught. The early Church, conscious that revelation had reached its climax, or that the "last times" had come, looked and yearned for the speedy return of the Lord for the consummation of his kingdom. But in the mystery that

2 Thess. ii.
1 sq.

shrouded the subject, the Apostle Paul did not allow this hope and expectation to alarm and confuse the churches under his care. Types of doctrinal teaching were unfolded by the Apostles, in which the same gospel was presented from

Paul.

different points of view—by Paul in a more dialectic method, and with predominant reference to the relation of gospel to law; by John, from the intuitions of the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who found in love a clew to the solution of all problems. Yet the same pre-eminence of love is depicted in rhythmical periods by Paul in one of his most impressive passages; and in Paul a deep mystical vein blends with the dialectic spirit. James is concerned to guard against the substitution of theoretical soundness of doctrine for the practical performance of duties.

It was no part of the intention of the Apostles and their helpers to create a permanent literature, nor did they foresee that their writings, which were called into being by special wants and emergencies, often by an inability to visit in person the churches which they addressed, would be compiled into a volume and stand in the eyes of posterity on a level with "the law and the prophets." For a considerable time the words and works of Jesus were orally related by the Apostles, and by other witnesses, to their converts. As the Apostles for a number of years spent much time together at Jerusalem, this oral teaching would naturally tend to assume a stereotyped form. This fact of an oral tradition preceding written narratives must be taken into account

The New-Testament writings.

in explaining the characteristics of the first three gospels. How far these are dependent on one another is a problem which critical analysis has not yet fully determined. That they existed in their present compass at about the time of the destruction of the temple by Titus, in the year 70—the first two, at least, prior to that event—is proved by the fact that in the record of the last discourse of Jesus, the second coming of the Lord is so closely associated with that catastrophe. That the second Gospel is an independent composition of Mark, who wrote what he had heard from Peter; that the first Gospel is to such an extent the production of Matthew, that it could properly bear his name; that the third Gospel emanates from a Gentile Christian, who was for a while a companion of Paul on his journeys, are well-established conclusions. Whatever difficulties attend the supposition that the fourth Gospel was written by John, they are outweighed by the perplexities that arise in attributing it to any other origin. The book of Acts was composed by Luke after the writing of the Gospel. We shall not be far out of the way in assuming A.D. 80 as the date of this book. Of the General or Catholic Epistles, the Epistle of James, the brother of Jesus, is probably the earliest, and is, perhaps, the oldest of all the New Testament writings. It was not improbably written as early as A.D. 50. The doubts that existed to some extent in the ancient Church as to the origin of Second Peter and of Jude, did not extend to the First Epistle of Peter, which must have been indited before A.D. 67. The Second and Third of John, like the Gospel by the same author, are among the latest of the New Testament documents. Of the thirteen epistles of Paul, Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, and Philemon were written, as we have already said, during his first imprisonment at Rome. Between the first and a second imprisonment is the probable place of First Timothy and Titus, while Second Timothy appears to have been composed during the second season of captivity, and to have been the last product of the aged Apostle's pen.¹ The question about the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, which was debated in ancient times, still occasions diversity of opinion. The prevailing judgment is adverse to the Pauline authorship. Luther is one of those who have ascribed it to the eloquent Alexandrian, Apollos. Many have attributed this writing to Barnabas. That it was composed while Jerusalem was still standing, is plain. Its design was to dissuade Jewish Christians from being betrayed by their fondness for the old rites into a desertion of the Christian faith. It exhibits the

¹2 Tim. iv. 7, 8.

typical character of these rites. The Apocalypse, at about the same time, foretold things shortly "to come to pass"—the downfall of Jewish and heathen ecclesiasticism, the fall of Jerusalem, and the prostration of the pagan dominion of Rome. On Rome, designated as Babylon, "drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus,"¹ the heaviest penalties are to fall. Beyond these events in the near future, the author, after the manner of the Old Testament prophets, lifts the veil on the final scenes of triumph and of judgment.

¹ Rev. xvii. 6.

PERIOD II.

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO CONSTANTINE (100-313).

PROGRESS OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL: ROMAN PERSECUTIONS.

MISSIONARY effort in this period was mainly directed to the conversion of the heathen. On the ruins of Jerusalem, Hadrian's colony of *Ælia Capitolina* was planted; so that even there the Church, in its character and modes of worship, was a Gentile community. Christianity was early carried to Edessa, the capital of the small state of Osrhene, in Mesopotamia. After the middle of the second century, the Church at Edessa was sufficiently flourishing to count among its members the king, Abgar Bar Manu. At about this time the gospel was preached in Persia, Media, Parthia, and Bactria. We have notices of churches in Arabia in the early part of the third century. They were visited several times by Origen, the celebrated Alexandrian Church teacher (185-254). In the middle of the fourth century a missionary, Theophilus, of Diu, found churches in India. In Egypt, Christianity made great progress, especially at Alexandria, whence it spread to Cyrene and other neighboring places. In upper Egypt, where the Coptic language and the superstition of the people were obstacles in its path, Christianity had, nevertheless, gained a foothold as early as towards the close of the second century. At this time the gospel had been planted in proconsular Africa, being conveyed thither from Rome, and there was a flourishing church at Carthage. In Gaul, where the Druidical system, with its priesthood and sacrificial worship, was the religion of the Celtic population, several churches were founded from Asia Minor. At Lyons and Vienne there were strong churches in the last quarter of the second century. At this time Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons,

Territorial
extension of
Christianity.

speaks of the establishment of Christianity in Germany, west of the Rhine, and Tertullian, the North African presbyter, speaks of Christianity in Britain. The fathers in the second century describe in glowing terms, and not without rhetorical exaggeration, the rapid conquests of the Gospel. The number of converts in the reign of Hadrian must have been very large. Otherwise we cannot account for the enthusiastic language of Justin Martyr respecting the multitude of professing Christians. Tertullian writes in a similar strain. Irenæus refers to Barbarians who have believed without having a knowledge of letters, through oral teaching merely.

From the accession of Vespasian (69-79), the first of the Flavian emperors, the Church had been left at peace for almost thirty years. The cruelties of Domitian (81-96) have been related on a previous page. Nerva (96-98), who succeeded this tyrant, was a mild prince. He reversed in all points the policy of his predecessor. With Trajan (98-117) there began a new era in the administration of the world's government. A regard for the public welfare took the place of the personal passions and the irresponsible despotism of the preceding period. Trajan was equally eminent in camp and in council. Sagacious, just, good-tempered, simple in his ways, taking pleasure in the company of men like Tacitus and the younger Pliny, he might be expected to be averse to severe measures against his Christian subjects. But he was a conservative, with a will to uphold the old Roman system of public order, and to strengthen the empire against disintegrating forces within, as well as against enemies on its borders. Of the rapid growth of the Church, at least in certain places, we have an interesting proof in the correspondence of Trajan with Pliny, who was proprætor in Bithynia. These letters, moreover, bring us to a landmark in the record of Roman persecutions. Pliny, writing in 111, represents that in that region many of both sexes, of all ages, and of every rank were accused of being Christians. This "superstition," as he calls Christianity, had diffused itself in country places as well as in cities. The temples of the heathen gods had been almost forsaken. Victims for sacrifice had found few purchasers. He desired special instruction as to the method of dealing with this sect that had grown to be so numerous. In reply, Trajan decides that they are to be let alone, unless they are prosecuted by an accuser who gives his name. If convicted, in case they refuse to supplicate the gods, they are to be punished. This response of Trajan is generally considered an

Rapid progress of Christianity.

Trajan and the Antonines.

epoch in the conflict of the gospel with the Roman state, as marking the date when Christianity was expressly made an illegal religion. No new statute, however, was issued by Trajan. There was simply an injunction to enforce existing law. But the attitude of the state, as thus defined in relation to the Christian faith, was adhered to, with intervals of lenity and indulgence, from that time. According to the more common belief respecting the date of the death of Ignatius, bishop of Antioch, it was during this reign, in 110, that he, more than willing to lay down his life for the Christian cause, was transported to Rome, and perished as a martyr in the amphitheatre. Hadrian (117-138) was versatile and cultivated, fond of literature and art, a vigorous ruler who spent the larger portion of his reign in travelling through the provinces, personally attending to their condition and wants. His temper was moody, and in his last days cruel. He built costly temples and was a strict adherent of the old religion. Yet, in reply to the inquiries of a proconsul in Asia Minor, he said, in substantial accordance with the mandate of Trajan, that mere petitions and outcries of the populace, demanding the death of the Christians, were not to be heeded. There must be a responsible complainant, and a trial and conviction in the usual way. False accusers were to be punished. Under Marcus Aurelius (161-180), Christians suffered both from popular fury and from the government. The virtuous emperors were the most resolute in the attempt to keep out religious innovation. This wise and philosophic ruler finds in the bearing of Christian martyrs only signs of obstinacy, and their exultation appears to him, as it naturally might to a Stoic, a "tragic show." In this reign, risings of the populace against the Christians were frequent. These were occasioned by the terrible calamities which the empire suffered. There was not only warfare without cessation; there were earthquakes and inundations. Famine and pestilence swept away multitudes of men. In 166, there was a plague, from the destructive effects of which, Niebuhr tells us that the empire never recovered.

Death of Polycarp (155), and of Justin (166). These sufferings were all charged to the account of the Christians and their alleged impiety. There was persecution in Asia Minor. One of the martyrs was the venerable Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, who had sat at the feet of John the Apostle. It was at the time of the Christian Easter festival, when the heathen were having their races and other games in the presence of the proconsul, Titus Quadratus. The aged saint was arrested by soldiers in a house in the neighborhood of the city, where he had taken refuge. He declined to avail himself of another oppor-

tunity to escape. When he was required to curse Christ, he answered : " Six and eighty years have I served him, and he has done me nothing but good ; and how could I curse him, my Lord and my Saviour ! " Refusing to renounce the faith, he was burned to death. Justin—Justin Martyr, as he is generally styled—whose writings present us with very valuable information concerning the Church of his time, was put to death at Rome. The Gallic churches of Lyons and Vienne suffered most. The details of their persecution are given in a letter from them to the churches of Asia Minor. Slandrous charges of incest and of other abominations practised in their meetings, were propagated and believed. Such rumors were common in the case of Christians and of other sects whose assemblies were private. The severity of the tortures, endured without flinching, even by young maidens, at the hands of heathen magistrates, almost surpasses belief. The story of the torments borne by Ponticus, a youth of sixteen, and by Blandina, a female slave, are of this character. Tortures prolonged from morning until night could only elicit from this delicate maiden the exclamation : " I am a Christian ; among us no evil is done." Pothinus, the aged bishop, who was past his ninetieth year, was brutally treated, and after two days expired in prison. The tale of an alleged miracle of a shower of rain, falling in answer to the prayers of " the thundering legion," a Christian body of soldiers in the army of Marcus Aurelius, is largely, if not wholly, fabulous. An interval of rest for the Church followed. The cruel Commodus (180–192), the ignoble son of a noble father, was indifferent to religious divisions and rivalries. From the death of Commodus to the accession of Diocletian, a period of ninety-two years, the emperors were appointed and deposed at the pleasure of the soldiers. Their treatment of Christianity depended on their personal character and on the degree of their zeal for the maintenance of the old Roman system of public order. It was not until Decius that a general persecution was undertaken. The closing part of the reign of Septimius Severus (193–211) witnessed a reversal of the mild policy which had marked the preceding years. There was persecution, especially in North Africa, where, among the martyrs, were two women, Perpetua and Felicitas, who evinced beyond most others the power of the Christian faith. To the former, as she said, " the dungeon became a palace." She did not yield to the pathetic entreaties of her aged father that she would recant. The persecution was continued under Caracalla (211–217). The disposition of succeeding emperors to amalgamate different religions, and the in-

The " soldier
emperors."

terest they felt in Oriental religious systems, contributed to the security of Christian worshippers. This was true in the case of the savage and profligate Elagabalus (218-222), and the more noble and devout Alexander Severus (222-235.) Under Maximinus, the Thracian (235-238), the fury of the heathen populace, which was stimulated by governors who were hostile to Christianity, was allowed to vent itself without check. Earthquakes in Cappadocia and Pontus, and signal calamities elsewhere, excited their superstitious rage, which displayed itself in the slaughter of Christians, to whose "impiety" these judgments were always attributed. Under the next two reigns, that of Gordian (238-244), and that of Philip, the Arabian (244-249), Christians were not molested by their rulers. Their numbers had so multiplied that Origen for the first time expresses the belief, which Christian teachers before him had not ventured to entertain, that the gospel, by its inherent power, and without help of miracle, would supplant the religion of the heathen. The prosperity and the bright prospects of the Church rekindled the hostility of its opposers. The Emperor Decius, a Pannonian by birth, set out to restore the unity and vigor of the empire. He was bent on bringing back the virtue and order of a former day, and deemed a revival of the policy of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius the best means to that end. Resolved to extirpate Christianity, Decius adopted a systematic method for attaining his object. All Christians, within a given time, were to appear before a magistrate, abjure their religion, and offer sacrifice to the gods of Rome. Many remained steadfast. Not a few gave way to terror, and either joined in some way in heathen worship, or procured false certificates that they had done so. Fortunately for the Church, the reign of Decius was short. Under Gallus (251-253), pestilence, spreading over the empire, and the occurrence of drought and famine in various provinces, once more stirred up the wrath of the heathen. An imperial edict was sent forth requiring all Roman subjects to sacrifice to the gods. Among the martyrs were two Roman bishops, Cornelius and Lucius. The work left unfinished by Decius was taken up by Valerian (253-260), whose decrees against the Church were skilfully framed. They included special enactments against all Christians of rank and distinction. In this persecution Cyprian, the venerable bishop of Carthage, was put to death, and also the Roman bishop Sixtus and four deacons of his church. In the case of Cyprian, the courtesy of the Roman officials and the external decorum of the whole proceeding, on which Gibbon dilates, only enhance the horror of such

Decius,
249-251.

a deed performed under the sanctions and forms of law. Gallienus (260-268), the son of Valerian, reversed his father's policy, restored exiled bishops to their places, and granted to Christians a practical toleration. Now, for about forty years, the Church enjoyed an almost unbroken rest. Then the last and most formidable of all the persecutions, not excepting the persecution of Decius, broke out. Diocletian, a man of great talents as a statesman, associated with him Maximianus as co-regent, and appointed two more *Cæsars*, each to rule an extensive district of the empire. One of these was Constantius Chlorus. The other was Galerius, who married Diocletian's daughter. Instigated by Galerius, and stimulated by the old Roman conservative feeling, Diocletian, in 303, determined to exterminate the Christian religion and to reinstate the ancient system of worship. In pursuance of this plan, a series of edicts, each more rigorous than the preceding, were deliberately framed for the accomplishment of his purpose. The Roman prisons were soon filled with bishops and other clergy. After the abdication of Diocletian, the influence of Constantius Chlorus, who presided over Gaul, Britain, and Spain, and had used his power to protect Christians, became more potent. But the new *Cæsar*, Maximinus, and Galerius kept up their savage proceedings. At length, in 311, Galerius utterly changed his course and proclaimed toleration. In 313, Constantine, now the sole ruler of the West, in connection with his colleague in the empire, Licinius, issued, at Milan, an edict of full toleration for both religions.

During the succession of persecutions which came to an end on the accession of Constantine to supreme power and his adoption of the Christian faith, there were very many who submitted to imprisonment, torture, and death. Not a few, especially after long seasons of quiet, lacked the courage to face the terror, and saved their lives at the cost of their Christian fidelity. To offer sacrifice to the heathen gods, to procure from the heathen false testimonies to the effect that they had renounced Christianity, or to give up copies of the Scriptures on the demand of the magistrates, excluded those guilty of these offences from Christian fellowship. As to the total number of martyrs in the first three centuries, it was doubtless over-estimated by the Church fathers, but it has been underrated by Gibbon, who draws a larger inference than is warranted from a passage in Origen. Gibbon, moreover, fails to take into account the multitude of instances where tortures were inflicted that resulted, not at once, yet eventually, in death. It was the heroic age in the history of the Church,

Diocletian,
284-305.

Behavior of
Christians
under per-
secution.

when, with no aid from an arm of flesh, the whole might of the Roman empire was victoriously encountered by the unarmed and unresisting adherents of the Christian faith. Imperial Rome, the conqueror of the world, was herself overcome by the bands of Christian disciples, whose meek but dauntless courage was more than a match for all her power.

CHAPTER II.

GOVERNMENT AND DISCIPLINE IN THE CHURCH.

WE have now to consider the organization of the churches. Among the special topics are the rise of episcopacy, the incoming of the sacerdotal idea of the ministry, the growth of the hierarchical system until the close of this period.

In the New Testament, as we have seen, there are two classes of officers in each church, called, respectively, elders or bishops, and deacons. After we cross the limit of the first century we find that with each board of elders there is a person to whom the name of "bishop" is specially applied, although, for a long time, he is likewise often called a presbyter. In other words, in the room of a twofold, we have a threefold, ministry. The period that elapsed between the destruction of Jerusalem and about the middle of the second century is obscure. For this interval our means of information are scanty. Much of the early Christian literature has perished. There is a list of authors who are known only through fragments preserved in later writers. Hence there are many questions about which we are left, more or less, in the dark. This question of the origin of the episcopate, as a distinct office from the presbyterate, is one of them. To Timothy, Titus, and other evangelists there was committed a certain superintendence of churches. But they discharged a special mission, and if it may be called a "movable episcopate," it is not thus described in Scripture, and was quite distinct from the localized episcopate with which we have to do. It is probable, to quote the language of Bishop Lightfoot, "that the solution suggested by the history of the word 'bishop,' and its transfer from the lower to the higher office, is the true solution, and that the episcopate was created out of the presbytery;" "that this creation was not so much an isolated act as a progressive

Rise of the
episcopate.

Episcopate
developed
from the
presbytery.

development, not advancing everywhere at a uniform rate, but exhibiting at one and the same time different stages of growth in different churches." Polycarp is designated as bishop by Irenæus, who knew him. But Polycarp, in his Epistle to the Church at Philippi, makes no mention of a bishop there in distinction from presbyters. The Corinthians had no bishop when Clement, in the year 96, wrote to them his epistle. If the office had existed there, the character and purpose of his epistle would have led him to make mention of it. In promoting the rise of the episcopate, the example of the presidency exercised by James at Jerusalem would have its effect in Syria. An early tradition ascribes a special agency in this matter to the Apostle John, who is said to have appointed bishops in the churches of Asia Minor. Irenæus tells us that Polycarp was appointed by apostles. It was in these Syrian and Asian churches that the episcopate appears to have first taken root. Personal eminence, derived it might be, as in the case of Polycarp, John's disciple, and of Clement of Rome, a pupil of Paul, from an intimate relation to an apostle, or from some other source of special esteem, would tend to give precedence to particular individuals, and to elevate them above their associate presbyters. It accords with experience that a presidency should arise in a body of peers such as the elders of a church were. The Greek term for bishop, which had been used to designate presbyters, was familiar to readers of the Septuagint, where it denotes an overseer. The same term, it would appear, was sometimes employed to designate an analogous office in heathen societies, both voluntary and municipal. The rise of sects and heresies, and the consequent demand for stricter discipline and for united action, would favor the rise of the episcopate. The bishop acquired importance, also, as the steward of the charitable funds of the church. He was the superintendent of the deacons in their work. This financial responsibility had something to do with the building up of the office. But reminiscences of the primitive parity of ministers long continued. Jerome, the great scholar of the fourth century, as an illustration of this fact, adverts to a peculiarity in the Church of Alexandria. "With the ancients," he says, "presbyters were the same as bishops; but gradually all the responsibility was deferred to a single person, that the thickets of heresies might be rooted out." The subjection of presbyters he designates as a "custom of the churches." Down to near the middle of the third century, Jerome says, when a bishop died at Alexandria, the twelve presbyters placed one of their own number in the episcopal office. That

Primitive
parity of
ministers.

this was done without any subsequent ordination is implied in his statement, and is affirmed by later authorities.

New light has been thrown on the early constitution of the Church by an ancient writing, lately discovered, the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." It was composed, it would appear, very early in the second century. Two classes of permanent officers of

the local church are referred to—bishops and deacons.

Nothing is said of a marked distinction of rank between them. A high importance is attributed to "apostles,"

who were travelling evangelists supported by the alms of the churches, and to "prophets" and "teachers," who were also itinerants, but might settle in a particular place. These three classes are the prominent guides in matters relating to doctrine. The office of bishops and deacons is primarily administrative; but they, too, perform this work of prophets and teachers. Later, there was a gradual displacement of the three classes of spiritual guides, whose call to their work depended on gifts of the Spirit, and who were tied to no particular flock. The bishops, the permanent officers of the local church, in the main absorbed their functions, and, while retaining their local relation, each to his own jurisdiction, were considered as standing in a general relation to the entire Church. The episcopal office thus assumed an altered aspect and an increased dignity.

The change to which we have just adverted was one element in the consolidation of the churches. It was a factor in the development of "catholic" Christianity. As we pass the middle of the second century, and advance to its close, we discern the means by which this important transformation was effected. The motive leading to it was the peril in which the churches were involved by Gnostic errors, of which an account will be given hereafter. To erect safeguards against the corruption of the faith was an impulse strongly, even when unconsciously, operative. One of these protective agencies was the general adoption of a "rule of faith" as a touchstone for the detection of heresy. Another was the formation of a canon of New Testament Scriptures. A third was an increased authority of bishops, and the position ascribed to them of successors of the apostles. Along with these means of union, the change in worship, by which the Lord's Supper came to be regarded as a sacred mystery, from which the presence of all, save communicants, was excluded, deserves to be mentioned. Moreover, a more definite theology was called into being as an antidote to heretical novelties. In this complex progress toward "catholic"

"Teaching of
the Twelve
Apostles."

organization, the particular feature on which we are now commenting, relates to the powers and functions of the clergy.

More important than mere alterations in government and discipline was the introduction and spread of the idea that the ministry are possessed of the attributes of a priesthood. It was an idea that borrowed support from the old Jewish economy to which the Christian system was imagined to be analogous. Its first suggestion may have come from the example of the heathen priesthood. This conception, once adopted, had the

Rise of sacerdotalism.

effect to exalt the clergy, especially bishops, in the popular estimation, and to separate the ministry, as a higher order, from the "laity." Episcopacy at the outset was a *governmental* arrangement. The sacerdotal theory does not make its appearance prior to the end of the second century. Tertullian is the first author by whom it is suggested, and even he does not make an earnest matter of it. It is evidently with him nothing more than a passing thought. In other places he asserts emphatically the universal priesthood of believers. "From his writings," says Harnack, "one must infer that before A.D. 200 the term priest was not in use to designate the bishop and presbyters of Carthage." The same thing is asserted by Bishop Lightfoot. The prerogatives of the episcopal office were gradually acquired. In the ordination of

Function of bishops.

presbyters it is probable that bishops and presbyters acted together. It is probable that the bishop might, in certain cases, act alone. The question whether presbyters could act alone, is still a subject of controversy. There are instances on record where such ordination was disallowed, but earlier it may have been permitted. In the Western Church, confirmation by the imposition of hands became separated from baptism. As early as the middle of the third century, with the advance of the sacerdotal theory, confirmation became an exclusive prerogative of the bishop. In the East, this change did not take place. Infant baptism, infant confirmation, and infant communion were associated together. The right to confirm remained with the presbyters.

Clement of Rome tells us that the apostles set over the churches presbyters and deacons, and provided that their places should be filled by other worthy men to be appointed by them with the concurrence of the Church. The design is represented to be to prevent disorder by keeping up an unbroken succession of officers. This idea of succession was familiar in municipal administration and in private corporations. To Irenæus and Tertullian, the chain of Bishops—link within link—had

The choice of officers : Apostolic succession.

come to be the guarantee of the transmission of genuine apostolic teaching in the churches. There is even a "gift of truth"—a *charisma*—qualifying them for the service. Earlier, we find in the Epistles of Ignatius that it is not the bishops, but the presbyters, who are the successors of the apostles ; and later, in the school of Cyprian, when the sacerdotal idea has taken root, this new element modifies the theory of succession. The privilege of proposing names for election caused the clergy to exercise more and more agency in the choice of their successors, until nothing was left to the people but the expression of approval. The bishop was chosen by the neighboring bishops, together with the clergy and laity of the particular church over which he was to preside.

With the increase in the number of Christians and the advance of clerical powers, the number of offices increased. As early as the middle of the third century, mention is made of a class of subdeacons. Still earlier there is a notice of lectors or readers. There was a body of singers ; a company of door-keepers, who sometimes formed a separate order ; a body of acolytes, who were attendants of the bishop ; and a class of exorcists, whose function it was to repeat formulas of abjuration for the expulsion of evil spirits. All these were loosely reckoned among the clergy, and contributed to raise the importance of the higher officers among them.

The clergy were supported partly by collections and gifts of the congregation. But they pursued the customary employments of society—tilled the ground, kept shop, worked at trades, held civil offices, etc. Cyprian protests against a long absence of the clergy on errands of business, and against the acceptance by them of civil offices, which would take up their time. Several centuries elapsed before trade was forbidden to the clergy, first in the West, and later in the East. Even then they were expected to learn some handicraft.

No one was allowed to become a clergyman who had been subjected to Church discipline. In the ancient Church, as among the contemporary heathen, there was a feeling averse to second marriages. A second marriage was a bar to entering the Christian ministry. In the East, marriages before receiving baptism were not counted as a part of this disqualification. No one who had married a widow, courtesan, slave, or mistress could be ordained ; but at what date this rule was adopted we cannot determine.

The connection of churches with one another was partly infor-

mal in its character, and partly organic. Christians made visits to other churches than those to which they belonged, sometimes for the express purpose of ascertaining their constitution and customs. Christian brethren on their journeys were hospitably entertained, provided they brought with them commendatory letters from their bishop. These letters admitted them to fraternal communion. News of threatened persecution was conveyed from one church to another. If a member was excommunicated, information of the fact was given by the bishop to other churches.

The connection of churches.

The first three centuries witnessed the gradual growth of a hierarchical organization. In this, as in earlier Church arrangements, secular and political models had a large influence. The spread of the sacerdotal idea, and, along with it, the tendency to imitate the Jewish system, were not without a strong effect.

Growth of the hierarchy.

Country churches, formed under the auspices of a neighboring city church, were affiliated with it, and had for their pastor a presbyter from the parent church, subject to its bishop. Rural churches planted independently had, each of them, its own bishop. The country bishops, for a considerable time, kept up their independence; but most of these churches, before the beginning of the fourth century, were subordinated, like the class of rural churches first mentioned, to the neighboring city community. Thus each city bishop had a jurisdiction covering the town and the vicinity. At first the clergy of the principal church in a town officiated, in an appointed order, in the several places of worship. At a later day it became common to assign a presbyter to each of them as a permanent pastor, subject, of course, to the bishop of the town, whose special connection was with the principal church.

Country and city bishops.

The bishop of the metropolis of each Roman province naturally acquired a precedence over other bishops within its limits. This was owing to the rank of the city, for, generally speaking, it was this consideration, more than any other, that determined the relative dignity of bishops. Another consideration was the fact that, not unfrequently, from the provincial capital the gospel was planted in many other places. The metropolitan arrangement was slow in being introduced in the West, because in that region the cities were comparatively few. The prerogatives of metropolitans were for a long time undefined. The theory of the equality and independence of bishops continued to be held, and on occasions was boldly asserted.

Further development of the hierarchy.

The hierarchical tendency led to the elevation to a still higher position of the bishops of a few principal cities, which were, moreover, regarded as having been seats of the apostles in a peculiar sense. The designation "archbishop," first applied to all metropolitans, came at length to be a title of these metropolitans of the first rank. They were also, eventually, styled primates or patriarchs. They were, in this period, the bishops of Antioch, Alexandria, and, especially, Rome. The political division of the empire into dioceses, when it was made, served to define the boundaries of the larger hierarchical districts.

The dignity of metropolitans was enhanced through synods, in which they were the presiding officers. Synods, analogous to what was familiar in Greek political affairs, began to be held in the second century. Their acts were called canons, and were considered to be binding on those who took part in them. The synods were held to be guided in their deliberations by the Holy Ghost. From them the lay element was gradually excluded.

The Church stood forth, after the middle of the second century, as a distinct body. It claimed to be, in opposition to heretical and schismatical parties, the "Catholic" Church. Membership in this one visible Church was believed to be necessary to salvation. Within the Church, and not beyond it, the Holy Spirit had his abode. The unity of the Church was secured and cemented by the episcopate—by the bishops, viewed as successors of the apostles. The episcopate, like the apostolate, in which Peter was the centre of unity, was a unit. This idea is developed and insisted on by Cyprian, who was involved in hard contests with dissenting sects.

The conception of the visible Church as one body, together with the exaggerated notion of Peter's precedence among the apostles, created a silent demand for a continuance of this primacy. Where should this be found—where could the central point of episcopal authority be discovered—save at the capital of the world, in the Church which, as men were coming to believe, Peter had founded, and of which he had been the first pastor? This relation of Peter to the Church of Rome is first alleged not earlier than about 170. It was a representation which easily found credence. The association of Peter and Paul with Rome made the Church there an apostolic see of the loftiest rank. The exalted political importance of Rome, and its transcendent fame among cities, lent an unequalled dignity to its bishop. The Roman Church was one of the largest; it included

The "Catholic" Church.

The primacy of the Church of Rome.

persons of rank ; it had been active in founding many other churches ; its gifts had flowed out to needy brethren in many places ; it was the first to feel the cruel hand of persecution, and often the first to make known to the churches the approach of danger ; its officers stood in the most exposed place, and not unfrequently perished as martyrs. All these influences conspired to direct the eyes of Christians to Rome as the foremost of the seats of ecclesiastical authority. Irenæus, in a remarkable passage, gives the highest place to the Roman Church as a reliable guardian of the traditions of apostolic teaching. Even Clement, the first writer after the apostles, speaking for the church of Rome, chides the Corinthian church in a tone of almost imperious admonition. The distinction of Rome, however, in the age of Irenæus, and even in the age of Cyprian, was that of a guardian, not an expounder, of apostolic teaching. No right of dictation or control, no infallibility in interpreting the Gospel, were conceded to it. And the sort of superiority attributed to the Roman bishop was accorded much more in the West than in the East.

Excommunication was the first step in Church discipline. It was a custom that had existed among the Jews in the case of here-
Church discipl. tics and wrong-doers. Excommunicated Christians, who
pline. showed signs of contrition, formed a class of “penitents.” They had a special seat in the meetings for worship, and had to go through a course of public humiliation, the duration and severity of which were appointed by the clergy. This was the origin of penance, and formed the “satisfaction” rendered by the repenting offender. Yet inward compunction was always exacted and implied, and absolution was granted on the condition of its presence. The bishop and other clergy laid their hands on the head of a penitent thus restored, and admitted him to the Lord’s Supper.

A distinction was made between venial and mortal sins. These last were held to forfeit the grace bestowed in baptism. A widespread and long-continued difference of opinion arose on the question whether persons cut off, as being guilty of mortal sin, from the fellowship of the Church—for example, those who had given way to terror, and renounced the faith—should, on the profession of repentance, be taken back to its communion. Schisms were occasioned by this warm dispute ; but the more lenient party, on the whole, maintained its ascendancy. Such were the schisms of Felicissimus, in opposition to Cyprian, in North Africa ; of Novatian in Rome ; and the schism of Meletius, which was of a later date, in Egypt.

The ecclesiastical spirit gained an increasing predominance over the free, prophetic element. This was gradually superseded by the more regular forms of official guidance. The teachings and prescriptions of the clergy were taking the place of the spontaneous utterances of inspired individuals—the ecstatic forms of inspiration. But there was resistance to this tendency, which was moving in the direction of clerical authority and sacerdotalism. One fruit of the reaction against it was Montanism, so called from Montanus, a Phrygian, whom his followers regarded as the incarnation of the promised Paraclete. The Montanists laid emphasis on the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. Among them were numerous prophets and prophetesses. One of their tenets was a belief in the speedy second coming of Christ. They were strenuous for strict discipline in the Church, in opposition to what they deemed laxness and false lenity. There were many disciples of this system, especially in the West; but Montanism was regarded and treated as a heresy. Its faith in continued prophetic inspiration, however, was shared by many who did not accept other peculiarities of the sect. The most conspicuous convert to Montanism was the enthusiastic Tertullian.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

THE surprising effect of Christianity in reforming the lives of men is amply attested by Christian writers. Justin Martyr, in an eloquent passage, dwells on the fact that the slaves of sensuality have become pure in morals, the avaricious and miserly freely give to those in need, the revengeful pray for their enemies. Origen inquires if the recovery of so great a number of persons from licentiousness, injustice, and covetousness could have been accomplished without divine help. Yet, he elsewhere observes, there are found in the churches “a greater number of those who have been converted from a not very wicked life than of those who have committed the most abominable sins.”

The love of Christians for each other astonished the heathen. There was a truth in the jibe of Lucian, which the humorist himself did not understand. “Their Master,” he said, “has persuaded them that they are all brothers.” The fraternal kindness extended to strangers, and to Christians of

Reforming
power of the
gospel.

Fraternal
love: char-
ity.

foreign nations, occasioned special surprise. Hospitality and almsgiving were universal among believers. Collections were regularly taken in the churches for the benefit of the poor. New converts would sometimes give their entire property to the Church. Special contributions were often taken for fellow-disciples—it might be, in distant places—who were in distress. In the case of those who were under arrest, or otherwise persecuted for their faith, there were perilous expressions of sympathy and helpfulness. When a pestilence broke out, it was noticed that the Christians did not desert the sick or neglect the burial of the dead. They even took care of the heathen who had none to befriend them. Charity was not unknown before among the heathen; but the word acquired a new force of meaning from the obedience rendered to the “new commandment” which Christ had given: “Love one another.” While the early writers laud Christianity for the effects wrought by it, in contrast with the influence of paganism, the complaints which they make of the faults of Christians, such as vanity, untruthfulness, and covetousness, show that ideal perfection is not to be claimed for the Church even in the days of its comparative purity.

Faults of
Christians.

One of the marked results of the gospel was the purification of domestic relations. Under the gospel there was “neither male nor female.” Woman was exalted as being a partaker, on a footing of equality, with man, in the communion with God and Christ. Marriage acquired a new sanctity. To the civil contract was added a religious service, in which the officers of the Church were present. The bride and bridegroom sat down together at the Lord’s Supper and presented an offering to the Church. In the prayer connected with the communion service the divine blessing was invoked upon them. Marriage with a heathen was discountenanced, one main reason being that it would be impossible for the believer to perform, without interference, the duties of the Christian life. Marriage with a heretic was, likewise, not allowable.

The family.

The profession of Christianity, of necessity, placed a gulf between the convert and the heathen around him. There was a wall of separation in social and political life. This was the case even when there was no unnecessary rigor on the part of the disciple of Jesus. Where there was a needless rigor, or undue religious enthusiasm, the division between the two classes was still more wide. All agreed that the emperor should be obeyed unless he commanded the doing of an unright

Separation
from hea-
thenism.

eous act. Some doubted whether a civil office should be held by a Christian—whether it was consistent with humility. There was a strong feeling against holding an office which obliged the incumbent to inflict capital punishment. Many doubted the lawfulness of serving in war; but it was allowed that a soldier, converted after taking service, might continue in the same vocation. All employments which involved a recognition of idolatry, magic, and astrology, were shunned. This rule cut off the Christian from a variety of lucrative occupations. Mythological conceptions, and heathen worship in some form, were involved in many branches of industry. This rule of itself excluded Christians from taking part, even by being present, in many customary amusements, in numerous festivals of different kinds, where idolatrous beliefs were implied or idolatrous practices were involved. Theatrical entertainments were disallowed, both on account of the immorality connected with them, and as being incompatible with the sobriety becoming a Christian. Actors and those who trained them were excluded from the Church. Cyprian will not consent to the continuance of one of the last-named class in his former employment. The faithful bishop preferred to contribute to his support out of his own purse. All gladiatorial combats were in the highest degree repugnant to Christian feeling.

Christianity had a negative and a positive work to accomplish. On the one hand, it was obliged to oppose the world so far as the world was under the power of evil. It had to take an aggressive posture in relation to all institutions and doings at war with the Christian spirit. On the other hand, it was a part of the task imposed on Christianity to take up and assimilate whatever in the world's life was truly natural. To purify and elevate, not to withstand or destroy, what was not wrong and was worth preserving, was incumbent on the Church. Hence, if there was danger of laxness, there was a danger, likewise, of an unwholesome austerity. Worldliness and asceticism were the Scylla and Charybdis between which the Church was called to steer its way.

Asceticism is a natural product of the oriental religions, especially of the religions of India, where monasticism has flourished.

Among Christians, oriental influences played a very minor part in fostering ascetic tendencies. Such tendencies existed to some extent among the heathen in the Roman empire, in consequence of the decay of the old religions, the conflict with evil within the soul, and the despondent mood of men's minds.

Amusements.

Worldliness
and asceticism.

Origin of
asceticism.

But Christian asceticism grew mainly out of that conflict between the flesh and the spirit, which the disciples of Christ were bound to wage, and, especially, out of the reaction against the prevalent sensuality and worldliness. It was a natural impulse to forsake literally a world which every holy feeling, not less than the precepts of the Master, prompted the Christian to forsake in spirit.

There was a rudimental form of asceticism in the Church, a "continence," or mortification of the appetites, which manifested itself in an increased value attached to fasting, and in a preference of celibacy to the married state. Not only did individuals set apart days of fasting for their own benefit; the custom was established of observing Wednesday and Friday, until three o'clock in the afternoon, as fast-days. They were called *dies stationum*, or sentry-days, when the Christian soldier stood on the watch. The penitent, when under Church discipline, practised fasting. The belief in the perpetual virginity of Mary, the celibate life of Jesus and of John the Baptist, and the advantages sometimes belonging to the unmarried state as furnishing better opportunities for doing good, did much to create the impression that to abstain from marriage is a praiseworthy act of self-denial. The most esteemed writers, from Cyprian back as far as Justin Martyr, give special honor to the class of women who, from early times, chose to remain single and to devote themselves to doing good. Consecration to virginity by a vow solemnly taken, which it was a great sin to violate, was an established custom in Cyprian's time. The order of virgins continued. In the fourth century it was already the custom for them to wear a dark-colored dress, and to be invested by the hands of the bishop with a bridal veil, a symbol that they were wedded to the Lord. It may be here added that an order of widows, distinct from the class of poor widows noticed in the Pastoral Epistles, appears in the fourth century. They are pledged to remain unmarried and to devote themselves to doing good. From them the class of deaconesses was often recruited, the duties of both classes being similar. Bishops and presbyters did not marry after their ordination. The eventual exclusion from clerical office of those who had married previously, was a natural step to take, but it was not taken in the Western Church until a later period. In the West the prejudice in favor of a celibate clergy was carried to a further extreme than in the East. The more the clergy were exalted above the laity, the higher rose the demands for a peculiar sanctity which were made upon them by the popular feeling. After the fourth century, with the devel-

Its earliest forms.

Fasting: celibacy.

opment of monasticism, there was a disposition to expect of the clergy forms of self-mortification, of which the monks had given the example.

As the number of Christians increased, larger rooms or edifices were required for their meetings. For a time they probably hired

Church edi-
fices.

or erected plain, rectangular buildings, without nave or aisles. Such buildings were numerous in Roman towns.

When these were no longer adequate, they constructed churches on the model of the Roman basilicas. The basilica was both a court-house and an exchange for commercial transactions. Its form was usually a rectangle, parted by rows of columns into aisles, that in the middle being the widest, and with a semicircular apse at one end where the tribunal of the magistrate was placed. In the houses of wealthy Romans there were domestic basilicas on the same general plan, but without columns at the ends, and with the roof of the nave carried higher. The variations of the church edifice from the public basilica have been thought by some to imply a copying of the similar apartments in private dwellings. It has been thought, also, that the atrium in front of the church indicates that the Roman house afforded the model for the structure. But neither of these conclusions is established. The basilica, with its nave and aisles, and with the apse in the rear, affording places of honor for the bishop and presbyters, was reproduced for Christian uses. In front of the dais in the apse, additional space was inclosed on a floor somewhat elevated. This was the choir, where were the *ambones* or reading-desks, of which there were one or more. Above the aisles there were sometimes galleries for strangers and spectators. Communicants occupied the main floor, while in the vestibule, opening into the nave, were catechumens and penitents. In the quadrangular atrium, in front, was a water-tank for the washing of hands before entering the church—an old Jewish custom. In the time of Diocletian there existed in some places stately church edifices. In Nicomedia the church towered above the emperor's palace. It is after Constantine's accession, however, that the era of church-building on a scale of magnificence fairly begins. He built splendid basilicas in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, and Constantinople. For a long period images in worship were conscientiously discarded. They first came into use in families. The pagan custom of decorative painting was followed by Christians, who painted—on goblets, for example—the shepherd with a lamb on his shoulders, and other pictorial emblems. Symbols in common use were the dove, significant of the Holy Spirit; a fish, the Greek

Pictures and
emblems.

word for which furnished the initial letters of the Saviour's name and office ; a ship, typical of the voyage of the soul and of the Church heavenward ; a lyre, to denote the believer's joy ; an anchor, a token of his hope. As early as the end of the third century, religious emblems were depicted in the churches. The cross was a common token among Christians, the sign of the cross being made by them on many occasions, as on rising in the morning and in moments of sudden peril. Gradually a kind of magical efficacy began to be attached to this sign. Yet the cross was not pictured in the churches.

The catacombs at Rome are ancient burial-places of Christians, excavated for this purpose ; for the Christians did not adopt the Roman practice of cremation. The winding ways in these subterranean sepulchres are several hundred miles in length. The date of the earliest Christian inscription is 72 A.D. They contain small chambers in which the eucharist was celebrated, and the agape, or love-feast, was held. These chambers were adorned with frescoes. A great number of objects have been taken from these ancient tombs, including bronze bells and other toys of children, mirrors, rings, various toilet articles, countless lamps. These things it was an early custom to deposit with the remains of the dead. The paintings in the catacombs are frequently typical of events in Scripture, such as Abraham's offering of Isaac, the flood with the ark floating on the waters. In the cemetery of Priscilla is a representation of Mary and the child Jesus, of a comparatively early date—how early we cannot determine. The epitaphs are instructive and touching. They express a joyful hope of the resurrection.

Fasts, at first voluntary, came to be ordained by Church law. The Christian festivals related to Christ, and commemorated the principal events of his life, with his death, resurrection, and ascension to glory. On the Lord's day, contrary to the custom on other days, prayer was offered, as a special token of joy, in a standing posture. The Jewish Christians, who were followed by the oriental churches, not only observed Sunday but Saturday also. The Roman Christians, on the contrary, fasted on Saturday. When we reach the time of Tertullian, about the year 200, we meet with recommendations to abstain, wholly or partially, from secular labor on Sunday. The first yearly festival generally observed was Easter, standing in the room of the ancient Passover. Controversies respecting the time and proper mode of the paschal observance sprung up, the most notable of which was

that between the Quarto-decimani of Asia Minor, or the Fourteenth-Day Christians, and Christians elsewhere. The Asia Minor churches, in the first three centuries, had the custom of observing the fourteenth day of the Jewish month, Nisan, on whatever day of the week it might occur. After Easter, followed Pentecost, lasting for fifty days, and commemorating the glorification of Jesus. Later, the fortieth day was kept as a memorial of his Ascension. About the end of this period, two new festivals came in. One was Epiphany, originating in the East, not improbably with Jewish Christians, and commemorating the baptism of Christ. The other was Christmas, a festival of Roman origin, taking the place of the heathen festival in honor of the sun, or of the deity bearing that name, which was celebrated at the winter solstice, or on the 25th of December, the time erroneously assigned for the solstice in the Julian calendar.

In the sub-apostolic age, worship continued to be a spontaneous, living expression of religious feeling. It was that self-oblation which Paul styled the Christian's "reasonable service," as being a spiritual act, freely performed. This was the character of Christian worship in the time of Justin Martyr (about 150). Later, as the second century draws to an end, from the days of Irenæus and Tertullian, new motives and another spirit are apparent. Worship is looked on more as a service to God, which it is an obligation to render, and as having a worth, even a sort of merit, of its own,

Public wor-
ship.

on account of which it is acceptable to him. In the public worship of God, Christians, except on Sunday, knelt in prayer. The Scriptures were read in extended passages. From the exhortations connected with these readings, the sermon was developed. At Alexandria, discussion was mingled to a considerable extent with the hortatory element, giving to the sermon a more intellectual cast. Church music, which at the outset consisted mainly of the singing of the psalms, flourished especially in Syria and at Alexandria. The music was very simple in its character. There was some sort of alternate singing in the worship of Christians, as it is described by Pliny. The introduction of antiphonal singing at Antioch is ascribed by tradition to Ignatius. In the third century, and, perhaps, earlier, the anthem of the angels¹ was expanded into the Greek original of the Latin hymn, the *Gloria in excelsis*, of later date.

In the Epistle of Clement of Rome, written not far from 96, there is found a prayer so elaborate in its form as to suggest that it may have been habitually used by him in public worship. The "Teach-

¹ Luke ii. 14.

ing of the Twelve Apostles" contains forms of prayer to be repeated at the Lord's Supper—forms to which, it is added, "the prophet is not bound." In Justin Martyr's description of the worship of Christians on the Lord's day, the prayers of the president appear to be extemporaneous; but the prayers of the people, before the eucharist, were, perhaps, according to a fixed form. Brief forms of prayer in an ancient book, called the "Apostolic Constitutions," were not improbably in use before the end of the second century. In the Diocletian persecution there is no account of any search for books of devotion or of any surrender of collections of this sort. At that time they did not exist. Yet it is probable that forms of prayer were then in use, which were embodied later in the liturgies, but were committed to memory. A reason for this course would exist in the veil of secrecy or mystery that was thrown over the eucharist, or the *disciplina arcani*.

Toward the conclusion of the second century we find it to be the custom to exclude non-communicants from being present at the Lord's Supper. After the preliminary services, at the close of the addresses by the bishop and presbyters, the unbaptized were dismissed. From the Latin word signifying dismissal (*missa*) the word *mass* is derived. The danger of persecution may have led at first to this privacy as regards the sacrament, but the idea of its peculiar solemnity, and the dread of profanation, were the main consideration. The example of the heathen mysteries, and of the distinction which the heathen made between the initiated and the uninitiated was not without its influence. Catechumens who were preparing for baptism were divided into classes, and gradually instructed in the mysteries of the faith. In the course of the third century, it came to be considered a duty to observe silence in the presence of unbelievers and of the untaught, respecting the more profound doctrines, such as the Trinity and the Atonement. Even the confession of faith at baptism was not to be committed to writing or disclosed. This reserve, extending thus far, continued until the heathen were converted, and the catechumenate passed away. After the sixth century we hear no more of this holy reticence—the *disciplina arcani*, as it has been called.

Baptism was preceded by regular instruction. At Alexandria, owing to the intelligence and mature age of many who were to be prepared for this rite, catechetical instruction took on a more elaborate form. In this way there grew up in that city the first school of theology, or seminary for the

Catechetical
instruction :
The Apostles'
Creed.

training of the clergy. The simple confession of faith in Christ, made at baptism, gradually expanded itself, until, in process of time, it grew, in the Western Church, into what was known as the Apostles' Creed. This, however, differed somewhat in form in the different churches, as Rufinus found to be the case when, late in the fourth century, he entered into the study of the subject. The name of Apostles' Creed may have been first given to it because it was made up of the teachings of the apostles, either recorded in the gospels or transmitted by tradition. A written symbol, containing the most of the Apostles' Creed as we now have it, existed in the church at Rome, and was repeated by candidates for baptism, prior to the middle of the second century. Afterwards the legend arose that the apostles had together composed it, each contributing a portion. The Apostles' Creed must not be confounded with the "rule of faith," which, however, was a paraphrase and expansion of it. The "rule of faith" was a short statement of the main facts of Christianity, to which Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen refer. From the latter part of the second century it served, but in varying forms, in the churches generally, as a shield against heretical perverters of the accepted doctrines. In the East there was little check upon changes in its form, and so it was not perpetuated. It was in Gaul, in the fifth century, that this venerable symbol attained to the precise form in which it has come down to us in the Latin Church. In the administration of baptism, the recipient renounced the service of Satan and the idolatry of the heathen. In the middle of the third century, we have the first notice of the use of formulas of exorcism in conjunction with this rite. The bishop laid his hands on the person baptized, using the sign of the cross and anointing him with oil. There were other ceremonies which were peculiar to certain places, such as the partaking of milk and honey, emblems of the blessings promised to the believer. This custom existed in North Africa. Infant baptism is recognized as a rite of the Church by Irenæus, and by Origen, who calls it an Apostolic custom. Tertullian urges a delay of baptism. Later fathers do the same on the ground that for sins committed after baptism, forgiveness is harder to be obtained. Sponsors confessed the faith in the name of the child, and engaged to give him a Christian training.

Infant baptism.

Early in the second century the agape, or love-feast, became disconnected from the Lord's Supper. Occasional improprieties and excesses at the table, and false imputations on the part of the heathen, would explain this change.

The agapæ—the love-feasts.

The peculiar ideas of sacredness, which gathered more and more about the eucharist, would naturally have an influence in this direction. The bread and wine were contributed by the flock and distributed by the deacons, the clergyman's prayer of thanks giving to the rite its name—the Eucharist. The bread and wine were conveyed to those who were not able to leave their houses. In North Africa and in other places, after the beginning of the third century, an increasing conviction that the rite was clothed with a mystical efficacy, led to the custom of bringing children to the sacrament. The ordinary practice was for the communion to be received on Sunday of each week. The reception of the Lord's Supper attended every event in life which was deemed of extraordinary moment. Among these occasions were the anniversaries of the death of loved friends. The day when a martyr died was kept as his birthday, or the day of his entrance into a higher life. On these natal days of the martyrs, Christians gathered about their burial-places; their good deeds and their sufferings were called to mind, and the sacrament was received. That prayers for the dead, who, though believers, were conceived of as still imperfect, were offered up on these and some other occasions, we have proof as early as the beginning of the third century, and the custom is then spoken of as one long established. An instance of prayer for the dead among the later Jews is given in the Second Book of Maccabees.¹ During the second century these observances were mostly kept within bounds. In the third century, a very high value began to be attached to the intercessions of martyrs, both before and after their death.

The Lord's
Supper.

The interces-
sions of mar-
tyrs.

CHAPTER IV.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE AND DOCTRINE.

THE Fathers, as the writers of the first six centuries are called, partake in general of the literary faults which characterize the period of decadence in Greek and Roman literature. Some of them, among the earlier authors especially, show in their style their lack of education. Among the patristic writers, however, are some who, in point of learning, are fully equal to the best of the contemporary classical authors, and even surpass

Character of
patristic
works.

¹ II. Maccabees xii. 43-45.

them in vigor of expression and weight of matter. For a considerable time all Christian writings were in the Greek language. The services of the Church, even at Rome, were at first held in that tongue. So far did the Greek influence prevail that not until the beginning of the third century did Latin writings of any importance appear, and even then it is not in Rome, but in one of the provinces in North Africa, that theological works are first composed in this language.

The Apostolic Fathers are a group of writers thus named from the supposition that they were personally conversant with one or more of the apostles. They are earnest and practical, but, as a rule, are not on a high level intellectually. The earliest of these books is the Epistle to the Corinthian church, by Clement of Rome, to whom Paul is thought to refer. It was sent about the year 96, when divisions were prevailing there, and the epistle is written, in the name of the Roman church, in order to pacify contention. The concluding portion of it, which has lately been discovered, is a prayer which it is possible that Clement was accustomed to use in divine service. What is called the Second Epistle of Clement is a homily by an unknown author (about 140). Seven epistles of Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, exist in a longer and shorter Greek form. The three which exist in the Syriac language are the result of an abridgment of the corresponding Greek epistles. The seven as found in the shorter Greek are probably genuine. That they are wholly free from interpolation we cannot be sure. These epistles were written while the author was a prisoner on the way to Rome to suffer martyrdom. They manifest a thirst for the martyr's crown. They insist, with tedious iteration, on the necessity of order in the churches, to be secured by obeying the bishop. Yet in the letter to the Romans, there is not the slightest hint that a bishop of Rome existed at that time. This is an argument for the early date of all the epistles, for they appear to be all from one author. The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians, the date of which is about 150, is not unworthy of the venerable martyr who had sat at the feet of the Apostle John. Perhaps a score of years earlier, a certain Hermas, not the Hermas to whom Paul refers,¹ wrote "The Shepherd," composed mostly of visions and parables, in an apocalyptic vein. They purport to be communications from an angel, rebuking the sins of Hermas himself and of the Church. There is internal evidence of the early date of the work. For example, bishops are not distinguished from

¹ Rom. xvi. 14.

presbyters. It was thought to be highly edifying, and for a period was very widely circulated in the early Church. *Hermas* was the Bunyan of those days, but without the genius of the tinker of Elstow. The epistle ascribed to *Barnabas* was not written by him. Its date, however, is probably not later than 120. We can affirm with confidence that it was composed early in the second century. But the author blunders in his description of Jewish ceremonies in a way impossible to a Levite like *Barnabas*. The writer was a Gentile Christian, probably an Alexandrian, who is opposing judaizing fomenters of division. He explains that the ritual of the Jews has passed away, and by the free use of allegory seeks to bring out the spiritual meaning of the ordinances, for the edification of Christian believers. The gem in this class of compositions is the anonymous Epistle to *Diognetus*. It is spirited in style, and has no doctrinal fault save an antipathy to Judaism, which is pushed to an extreme. Valuable fragments of *Papias*, a contemporary of John the Apostle, are preserved in citations of the ancient Church historian, *Eusebius*.

Few post-apostolic writings are of earlier date than "The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," a manuscript copy of which was discovered in 1875. It is a manual, the first part of which is composed of instructions in practical duty for catechumens. These are followed by rules respecting the reception to be accorded to different classes of Christian teachers and their proper demeanor, together with regulations bearing on the rites of worship and on discipline. The little work concludes with exhortations to vigilance and to the holding of frequent meetings for mutual edification, in view of the dangers and terrors of the latter days and the expected advent of Christ. The first six chapters of the "Teaching" are thought by some scholars to have been a Jewish manual of instruction for the young, which was adopted, enlarged, and edited by a Christian writer.

While Christians were persecuted by magistrates and mobs, they sought to convince their adversaries, and to overcome prejudice, by arguments addressed to reason. The Christian cause was defended by the class of writers called Apologists. Some of their works were inscribed to emperors to dissuade them from persecution, and some were appeals to the body of heathen or of Jews. A part of the *Apology of Aristides of Athens* (124) has lately been found. Among the works of this class which survive from the second century, are three treatises of Justin, "philosopher and martyr." He had studied different systems of Greek philosophy, giving his adhesion finally to the Platonic. After his

conversion he still wore the philosopher's mantle, and, without holding any office in the Church, travelled from place to place, teaching the gospel by conversation with such as were willing to confer with him. At Rome he addressed his First Apology to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, about 138. Afterwards, in 161, he inscribed a Second Apology to Marcus Aurelius. His third work, the Dialogue with Trypho, is an attempt to convince Jews of the messiahship of Jesus, and to answer their usual objections to the Christian faith. The writings of Justin Martyr, besides bringing before us the reasoning by which heathen objections and calumnies were met, lift the veil for the first time upon the doctrinal views of Christians not long after the apostolic age. Tatian, a Syrian by birth, was an itinerant philosopher, like Justin, by whom he was converted. He attacked the heathen mythology in a "Discourse to the Greeks," which was composed not far from 160. He was the first to weave the four Gospels into a single narrative that has been recently recovered, the "Diatessaron," or Gospel of the Four. In 177, Athenagoras, previously an Athenian philosopher, wrote an apologetic work bearing the title "An Embassy concerning the Christians." A contemporary, Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, addressed a work in vindication of the gospel to a friend named Autolycus. Hermias, who had been a philosopher, wrote a book of a satirical cast, entitled, "Mockery of the Heathen Philosophers." The apologies just named are all extant. Among the lost writings, the "Memorials" of the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Age, written in the middle of the second century by Hegesippus, a Christian of Jewish extraction, might, perhaps, be classified under this head. It was the earliest of the Church histories after the days of the apostles.

There is one apologist who wrote in Latin, and who wrote with no small degree of vigor and elegance. This is Minucius Felix.

Minucius Felix. His date and place of residence are not ascertained. He is thought to have been a lawyer at Rome, and it is not improbable that he wrote his "Octavius" before the close of the second century. It is an imaginary dialogue between a Christian and a heathen.

The ablest writers of this period were the Alexandrian teachers. Alexandria was the seat of a great university, with its large libraries, its learned professors, and its throng of inquisitive and active-minded youth. There, in the Jewish philosophy of Philo, Plato's teaching had been blended with the doctrine of Moses and the prophets, and by means of allegory the Old Testament had been made to re-echo with a modified sound the teaching

The Alexan-
drian teachers.

of the Greek schools of thought. In such a community, as Christians multiplied, the instruction of catechumens often required doctrinal explanations much more advanced than were requisite in ordinary churches. Thus the catechetical school developed itself into a theological seminary, where abstruse points of divinity were handled and young men were trained for the clerical office. The Alexandrian theology was the first serious attempt among those who adhered to the great facts and truths of the gospel, to adjust the relations of Christian doctrine to reason and philosophy. It was the first attempt to build a bridge between Christianity and the wisdom of the Gentiles. As far as philosophy was concerned, the influence of Plato was still predominant, as had been the fact in the school of Philo. The method of allegory which characterized the Rabbinical schools was continued in the interpretation of Scripture. The first of the Alexandrian Church teachers of whom we have an account, was Pantænus. Whatever merit belonged to him

Clement,
c. 200.

was eclipsed by the fame of his pupil and successor, Flavius Clemens—Clement of Alexandria, as he is commonly designated, to distinguish him from the Roman apostolic father of the same name. Clement had travelled far and wide, had been a diligent student of philosophy, and was versed in the ancient classics. He exhibits in his works a fertile though discursive genius, and a mind both deep in thought and broad in its sympathies. He leads the way in discerning the points of affinity between choice utterances of the heathen sages and the teachings of the New Testament. Eminent as Clement was, he was out-

Origen,
185-254.

stripped in the qualities that make up a great theologian by Origen, called, from his herculean labors, the Adamantine. This illustrious scholar and thinker was a pioneer in the department of systematic theology; he wrote the most prominent and valuable of the early defences of the gospel against the attacks of heathenism—his work in reply to Celsus; he spent twenty-seven years in preparing his edition of the Old Testament, the Hexapla; and, by his commentaries, he did a greater service in the exposition of Scripture than any other of the early patristic writers. He sanctioned, however, by his example, the allegorical method of exegesis to which we have referred. His influence as an instructor of the clergy, as well as an author, was very extensive. The enmity of his envious bishop, Demetrius, did not rob him of the esteem of the churches. The tendency of Origen's thought was spiritual as well as speculative. This appears in the Alexandrian ideas respecting the resurrection, the sacraments, and

the sources of the suffering of the condemned. These teachers carried the doctrine of reserve, or economy, as it was called, in the communication of truth to the less intellectual and less educated class of believers, somewhat beyond the proper limit. Besides a prudent silence on matters above the comprehension of the pupil, they thought it not wrong to appear to countenance erroneous and superstitious beliefs which were deemed to be not harmful in their effect.

Several authors in this period, because their writings are almost exclusively of a controversial character, in opposition to heretical parties, are termed Polemics. Preëminent in this list is Irenæus, whose copious treatise "Against Heresies"—for this is its title—is one of the principal Christian writings of the second century. Born in the East, in his youth an acquaintance of Polycarp, and standing thus at only one remove from the Apostle John, he spent his life mainly in the West, being first a presbyter, and then, as the successor of Pothinus, bishop at Lyons. His work is an elaborate confutation of the Gnostic heresies, whose disciples were then the most formidable adversaries of the Church and of the gospel. Hippolytus, a hearer of Irenæus at Lyons, and bishop at Portus, near Rome, composed a "Refutation of all Heresies." The root of the heresies, as he judged, lay in the perverse speculations of the philosophers.

The North African writers are the pioneers in the creation of a Latin Christian literature. The first of these to attain distinction, and in this period the most eminent of all of them, was Tertullian.

He was familiar with Roman law, and seems to have been, before his conversion, an advocate. He introduced legal phraseology and Roman legal conceptions into theological discussions. He was endowed with genius, and he was a man of sincere and earnest Christian feeling. He was naturally vehement, so that a certain extravagance and a passionate tone pervade his writings. They relate to a multiplicity of themes, both doctrinal and practical. His native fervor had much to do with his adoption of the tenets of the Montanists.

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, in contrast with Tertullian, wrote mainly on Church government and discipline, with a sobriety of style in keeping with his native character, and with his peculiar sphere of activity as an ecclesiastical leader.

There were not wanting apocryphal and spurious writings in this period. The "Sibylline Oracles" is a collection of prophecies, partly Jewish, and antedating the birth of Jesus, and partly Chris-

The Polemics: Irenæus, c. 180; Hippolytus, c. 200.

The North-African writers: Tertullian, c. 200.

Cyprian, d. 258.

tian. They relate to the Messiah and his work, and were invented with a pious intent to disseminate what their authors considered important religious truths. They are frequently quoted by early ecclesiastical writers. The "Pseudo-Clementine Homilies," with two later works based upon them, the "Recognitions" and the "Epitome," are a kind of theological romance, purporting to come from Clement of Rome, and exhibiting a type of doctrine in which Ebionitic and Gnostic elements are mixed in about equal proportions. The "Homilies" were composed somewhere about 170. The apocryphal gospels now extant were composed later than the limit of this period, to fill out blanks in the evangelists' record of the life of Jesus, or to promote some doctrinal interest. Portions of three or four of these later gospels may have been composed earlier, and are, perhaps, identical with writings mentioned by authors of the second or third century. Such apocryphal gospels as existed in the present period, as the "Gospel of the Egyptians," had but a local and limited circulation. They were quite as apt to be didactic tracts as narratives. The "Gospel of the Hebrews," used by the Ebionites, was based on Matthew, and Marcion's gospel, it is quite evident, was an abridgment of Luke.

The Church in the second century stood in opposition to the generic forms of heresy, Ebionitism and Gnosticism.

The judaizing Christians were called Ebionites, a name signifying "the poor," or "paupers." This name was originally given in the way of derision by the Jews to the Jewish Christians generally. The Ebionites embraced all those who refused to give up the Old Testament ceremonial observances. But they included two classes which were distinct from each other. The Nazareans clung to the ancient ceremonies, but they did not denounce the Gentile believers. They were the remnant of the more moderate Jewish Christians who were not prepared to surrender the national customs. Late in the fourth century they still lingered in the synagogues of the East. The more rigid Ebionites were the successors of the judaizers of the Apostle Paul's time. They were bitterly hostile to this apostle. They considered Jesus to be a prophet, the promulgator of the law in a more rigid form, and held that at his baptism, on the significance of which they laid great emphasis, he was furnished with his higher powers. They denied his miraculous birth, and passed lightly over his sufferings and death. With the Gentile believers who did not adopt the

Apocryphal
and spuri-
ous writings.

The Ebion-
ites.

Jewish rites they would have no fellowship. The only gospel which they used was one form or recension of Matthew.

We find traces of a third sort of Ebionites who differ from both the main divisions just described. These are the Essenian Ebionites, as they may be called, whose views were a mixture of Jewish Christian or judaizing opinions with notions caught up by Christian fugitives from Jerusalem, in the time of the siege, from the Essenes dwelling near the Dead Sea. Some of these Essenian Ebionites, who may with equal propriety be styled Gnostics, we find in Asia Minor during the lifetime of the apostles. One of the sects which may be classified under this category, is the Elkesaites, whose home was near the Dead Sea, and whose origin is placed in the reign of Trajan. They considered the Old Testament law as still binding, but discarded sacrifices, and held notions of Christ which were akin to Gnostic speculations.

A far more subtle and dangerous form of error was Gnosticism. The Gnostics comprised numerous and widely scattered parties, which followed different leaders. The germs of this heresy are brought to our notice in several books of the New Testament. The presence of persons infected with this kind of error in the Church at Colosse created apprehension in the mind of Paul.¹ Gnostics are referred to by John when he speaks of some who deny that Christ had come in the flesh.² It was persons of this class who called in question the reality of his human nature. The Gnostics claimed to be possessed of a deeper *gnosis*, or discernment of religious truth, than ordinary Christians were capable of. They founded their pretension on a perverse interpretation of Paul's words relative to "wisdom," in 1 Corinthians, ii. 6. Their aim was to reduce Christianity to a philosophy, and to exhibit its relation to previously existing systems, in particular to the Old Testament. Hence they drew their materials from various quarters, and while intending to honor Christianity were really eclectics in religion. A leading feature in their creeds was oriental dualism, which after the conquests of Alexander was largely mingled, especially in Egypt and Asia Minor, with Greek philosophical and religious thought. They agreed in the tenet that the God of the Jews, the creator of this world, whom they called the Demiurge, was not the Supreme Being. Evil they identified with matter. To the Supreme Being, the Absolute, no predicates can be attached. He is the ineffable one. From him emanate beings called "æons," forming a chain of existences below him, and filling up the void

¹ Col. ii. 8-23.

² 1 John iv. 3.

between him and the Demiurge. The æons, whose name is legion, are hypostatized attributes—attributes conceived of as personal—which in turn generate other æons below them. Thus in the room of the abstract ideas of Greek philosophy we have mythological persons, like the creations of oriental phantasy. The questions that busied the Gnostics were such as were raised by the Græco-Roman and the Græco-Jewish philosophy: How did the world of matter originate? What is the origin of evil? How is evil to be escaped? What is the nature and destiny of man? Men were divided by them into three classes—the spiritual, the psychic, and the carnal. The liberation of psychical natures, children of light, from their entanglement in matter, was the process of redemption. The historical Christ was a mere man, but he was the mask or vehicle of a higher æon, the heavenly Christ, who acted in him and through him, but without being really incarnate. Gnosticism would have severed Christianity from its organic relation to the Old Testament system. It was thus the antipode of Ebionitism. It was a bold attempt to build up a cosmology and a philosophy of history, in which redemption through Christ should find a place.

There were two general divisions of Gnostic systems. In the Judaistic Gnostic systems, whose principal seat was Alexandria, the Demiurge, while inferior, was still subordinate to the Supreme God, and unconsciously carried out his designs. In the Anti-judaic systems, which sprung up mainly in Syria, the Demiurge was conceived of as hostile to the Supreme Being, by whom his designs are baffled. One of the earliest of the judaizing Gnostics was Cerinthus, supposed to be a native of Alexandria, who is described as a contemporary and opposer of the Apostle John at Ephesus. His system contained a large admixture of Ebionitism. Yet he distinguished the maker of the world from God, and the earthly Jesus from the heavenly Christ, who was connected with him in a temporary union. The most famous leaders of this class of Gnostics were Basilides (c. 130) and Valentinus (c. 150). Saturninus was an eminent teacher in the Anti-judaic branch of the Gnostic schools. These rejected the Old Testament system, finding no bond of friendly connection between Judaism and the gospel.

In the religions of the East, the serpent figures prominently, now as the insidious author of evil, and now as opening beneficently the gates of knowledge to men. The Ophites, with the kindred sects of Naasseni and Peratæ, made much of the serpent as the redeeming power, mingled astrology with their teachings, and were hostile to the Old Testament religion. This

Two classes
of Gnostics.

The Ophites.

hostility was carried so far by another sect, that they called themselves Cainites, and pronounced the evil characters of the Old Testament to be those who were really deserving of honor.

One of the most noted of the representatives of the Anti-judaic tendency was Marcion, a native of Sinope in Pontus. He could find Marcion, c. 140. no point of union between justice and love. The retributive feeling ascribed to God in the Old Testament, struck him as inconsistent with the free grace of the gospel. Paul was the only apostle whom he acknowledged; the others had corrupted the pure teaching of Christ. Hence Marcion accepted Paul's epistles, and the gospel of Luke in a mutilated form. He expurgated from the third gospel passages in which the Old Testament law was recognized as of divine origin. Marcion was an earnest man, sincerely mistaken in his convictions, and he won many adherents.

Under the head of Gnosticism, it is proper to make mention of the Manichæans, whose influence, for a number of centuries after they arose, was very important and wide-spread. The Manichæans. The Christian ingredients form so minor a part in their creed that Manichæism, in its primitive form, is rather, like the faith of Mohammed, to be considered a distinct religion. What we know of Mani, its founder, is mostly derived from untrustworthy and conflicting legends. We may believe that he was a Persian of high birth; that he was brought up in Babylonia, and there imbibed notions in religion from Mandæans or other sects of "Baptizers," whose creed was tinged with Christian elements; that in his thirtieth year (245 A.D.), he came forward in Persia as a religious teacher claiming to be inspired, and taught a medley of opinions, the ground-work of which was the Semitic or Babylonian religion, and not the Zoroastrian, although characteristic Persian beliefs were compounded with other elements in his system; that he won disciples, and was finally, in 276, put to death by the Persian government for his deviations from the creed of Parsism. He composed many works, all of which are lost. In the Manichæan system, as promulgated by its adherents, the universe was divided into a kingdom of light and a kingdom of darkness, in antagonism to one another. In human nature, the two elements, owing to the agency of Satan, a product of the kingdom of darkness, have become mingled. To deliver the light from the bonds of darkness is a physical process, and is the work of a succession of prophets, of whom the celestial Christ, not the Jesus of the Jews, is one. The spirits of light who redeem the world have their abode in the sun.

Mani himself was the promised Paraclete. The Manichæan system was severely ascetic as well as dualistic. There were rigid fasts, and marriage was abjured. The ascetic features of the system appear to indicate a Buddhistic source. The sect was thoroughly organized. At the head were twelve apostles. The elect were a class above the "auditors" or novices. Manichæism spread in the East, and gained a great number of disciples in the Roman empire. Augustine, before his conversion, was for a number of years one of its adherents. They were persecuted by Diocletian, and by the Christian emperors who followed him. They were banished by Valentinian III. Under Justinian, to be a Manichæan was a capital offence. Yet the main ideas of the sect lingered, in one form or another, among sectaries in the Church until the thirteenth century.

Gnosticism was not an unmixed evil. It was the first attempt, crude though it was, to place Christianity in an intelligible relation to other great religious systems, and to the plan of history. It stimulated the development of theological science. Its awakening influence in this direction is seen in its opponents, such as Irenæus and Hippolytus. It was at Alexandria and Antioch, the principal seats of Gnosticism, that systematic theology first arose and flourished. On the other hand, Gnosticism is a perpetual warning against the confounding of physical with moral evil, and the reduction of redemption to a process of nature.

Jesus wrote nothing. The disciples whom he trained were not selected with reference to qualifications for literary composition.

Rise of the
New Testa-
ment canon.

To this sort of work they would not be naturally inclined. The writings of the apostles, Paul included, were supplementary to their oral teaching. They were called out by emergencies, like the troubles in the Church at Corinth or Paul's inability at the time to visit Rome. They were generally sent by messengers, who were to add to them oral communications. There was no thought of compiling these letters or the gospels into a volume. At the outset, the sacred "Scriptures," the writings cited as such, were the books of the Old Testament. With them the words of the Lord were quoted as of divine authority. As early as A.D. 150, as we learn from Justin Martyr, the gospels included in the canon were read in the Christian assemblies on Sunday. But the apostles were always regarded as specially chosen for their work and as specially inspired. When heretical sects arose, and especially when they began to circulate forged apostolic writings,

there was a new interest awakened in the collection and preservation of the genuine writings of the apostles. By them the orthodox traditional creed could be fortified against the perversion and misrepresentation by which it was assailed. The heretics were already in the field with canons of their own framing. Marcion made a collection with a view to support his eccentric opinions. The churches proceeded to join with the four Gospels, whose authority as records of the life and teaching of Christ had before become established, the other writings of apostolic authorship. These collections were not, at the beginning, uniform in their contents. Certain books were known in one place that were not known in another. Certain books might be deemed genuine by some, but be doubted by others. A landmark in the progress of the formation of the canon is furnished by the oldest versions.

The ancient versions.

The Syrian translation, or the Peshito, and the Old Latin translation, which was in use in North Africa, date from the closing part of the second century. The Peshito omits the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Second Epistle of Peter, Jude, and the Apocalypse. The Old Latin omits the Epistle of James and the Second Epistle of Peter, and at first the Epistle to the Hebrews. Such variations continued to exist until the end of this period. A little later, Eusebius, writing about 325, enumerates seven writings now in the New Testament which were not universally received.

The "Antilegomena."

He calls them Antilegomena. These disputed books were the Epistles of James and Jude, the Second Epistle of Peter, the Second and Third of John, the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the Apocalypse. Several books not embraced in our canon were held in special reverence, and were often read in the churches. These were the Epistles of Clement of Rome and Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas. At length the line was distinctly drawn which excluded these, as being of lower rank, from the list of canonical writings.

In opposition to heretical speculations, great weight was laid upon tradition as a source of evidence respecting the teaching of the apostles. The principal churches were honored as the witnesses to what this had been, and as its trustworthy guardians. The authority of the Scriptures was considered to be final and conclusive; but their inner sense the Alexandrians held that not all were capable of discerning. According to this school, a more than common development of faith was requisite for this peculiar insight. The tendency was to high views of the extent of inspiration, such as the Jews cherished in

Traditions prized; authority of Scripture.

regard to the Old Testament books ; but the Alexandrians avoided extremes on this subject. The defences of Christianity were adapted to the nature of the attacks made upon it. In this period, as distinguished from subsequent times, it was the personal character of Christians that specially called for vindication. Charges of atheism, of sedition, of misanthropy, of secret violations of decency and morality, were repelled. But the assailants of the gospel, Celsus in particular, bring forward a great variety of imputations relating to its contents and to the station and characteristics of Christian believers. Many modern aspersions upon Christianity were anticipated on the pages of this early and astute antagonist.

Defences of
Christianity.

The doctrine
concerning
God.

The early fathers generally claim that an obscure knowledge of God is innate in the human mind, but they make use of arguments, especially the argument from design. Tertullian dwells on the spontaneous testimony of the soul, uttered under excitement and in unguarded moments, when nature speaks out. Christian teachers did a great work in purifying the minds of believers of gross, materialistic associations connected with the Deity, the effect of heathenism. The Alexandrians were peculiar in holding that divine punishments are purely disciplinary in their intent. The eternity of matter was denied, and the world was held to have been created out of nothing. One of the distinctive features of Christian doctrine was the assertion of a particular providence. The care of God extends to all individuals, and over all occurrences, whether great or small. But with all the emphasis which the fathers of this period lay upon the universal providence of God, they hold to no predestination that clashes with the freedom of the human will. The appointment of men to reward or punishment in the future, is based on the divine foreknowledge of their free and responsible actions. Having fatalism, as it was inculcated, for example, by the Stoics, to resist, the Church teachers kept clear of whatever could be confounded with this obnoxious tenet.

The freedom
of the will.

The divinity
of Christ.

We should not expect from the apostolic fathers the discussion of such a question as the relation of Christ to God the Father. But there is manifest in their writings a prevailing sense of the unique, exalted rank of the Son of God. In Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, and in the Epistle to Diognetus, the preëxistence and incarnation of Jesus appear to be distinctly implied. Such views, it was claimed by writers of the third century, lay at the root of early hymns and doxologies. Justin Martyr is the first to de-

velope the doctrine of the divine Word, or Logos, as incarnate in Christ. It was the Word who appeared in the theophanies of the Old Testament. He is begotten before all creatures. Tertullian is the first to use the term "trinity," as applied to the Father, Son, and Spirit. Origen affirms the generation of the Son, by whom all things are made, to be not an act of God in time, but eternal. In the East there was more anxiety to hold fast to the distinction of persons in the Deity, and, at the same time, to shun tritheism. Hence, largely for this reason, statements are made which logically imply in the Son a subordination not congruous with true divinity, and not in harmony with other statements from the same authors. There were those who dissented from the doctrine of a distinction of persons in the divine being. These were called Monarchian-ism. Monarchians. They were of two classes. First, there were humanitarians, who seem not to have been numerous, who regarded Jesus as a mere man. There were others, whose view spread much more widely, who identified the Father with the Son, admitting no personal distinction between the two, or between them and the Spirit. The Patripassianists, teaching that it was the Father who suffered on the cross, and the Sabellians, were the most prominent representatives of this theory. It was embraced by not a few from fear of a polytheistic danger as connected with the more orthodox opinion. The Holy Spirit was regarded as a personal heavenly agent, and held (except by Monarchians) to be distinct from the Father and the Son. Yet the functions of the Word, or Logos, and of the Spirit, were not carefully distinguished. Respecting the precise relation of the Spirit to the other Persons, there was little inquiry.

The belief in a realm of angelic spirits was universal in the Church. They were the instruments of divine providence and the messengers of God. Not only were they guardians of nations, but each individual was held to have his guardian angel, fulfilling an office like that of the tutelar genius under the old religion. Yet angels were only the creatures of God, and were subject to his will. There is no clear proof that in this period they were invoked. Physical and moral evils were ascribed to the influence of Satan and of subordinate evil spirits. They are called by Origen the executioners of God. All sorts of calamities, national and personal, were attributed to their agency. The whole system of heathen worship was frequently connected with Satan, as its author. Yet evil angels were creatures; they were subject to divine control, and their power over man depended on the consent of his will.

The incorporeal nature of the human soul is affirmed by almost all the fathers. Sometimes the soul is made to consist of a higher or spiritual, and a lower or animal, nature. Sometimes the division is threefold—the body, the animal soul, and the rational spirit. It was held that the soul is immediately created. Tertullian was peculiar in advancing the traducian theory that the soul is propagated with the body. Man was made in the image of God. A distinction was early drawn between *image* and *similitude*, the former denoting his natural capacities and the latter his original character. All maintained the freedom of the will: the Greek fathers were emphatic in asserting its autonomy. The fathers frequently make man dependent on God for the continuance of his being hereafter: they hold that immortality is a divine gift. This is the view of Justin. Others make immortality an inherent property of the soul.

All the fathers in this period teach the universality of sin. They hold to a remaining capacity for right action, and they do not affirm the absolute impotence of the fallen will. Human depravity springs from the voluntary sin of Adam, by whom death was brought into the world. From him we receive a heritage of depraved inclinations. The Greek fathers, however, bring in the self-determination of the individual as the condition of his guilt. The Latin fathers, of whom Tertullian is a leading example, make more of the innate vitiosity of men, derived by inheritance from the father of the race. Even these, however, still affirm human freedom; but their thoughts pave the way for the Augustinian conceptions of a later day.

There was comparatively little discussion relative to the divine and the human natures in Christ, or the interior constitution of his person. Some of the earlier writers speak of the Word, or Logos, as in him holding the place of that rational spirit which exists in men generally. Justin is one of them. But the presence in Jesus of a human soul, in union with the divine, is implied in Irenæus, and was brought out in a clear light by Origen. The sinless character of Christ was universally taught. His supernatural birth was recognized by all.

From the beginning it was held on all hands that the work of Christ went beyond that of a teacher and legislator. He was a Redeemer of mankind in a more profound sense. His work included an atonement, or a ground of forgiveness. As to the method of the atonement, there was no uniform view and little thorough scrutiny. One representation, which is found in

The human
soul.

The doctrine
of sin.

The person
of Christ.

The atone-
ment.

numerous writers, sets the work of Jesus in a relation to Satan. His death was a ransom paid to Satan, it being assumed that Satan, by man's self-surrender, had acquired a certain right of control. This general notion is presented with various modifications. But along with it we find other and more reasonable conceptions. Especially is this the fact in the writings of Irenæus, who founds his view on the idea of Christ as the representative of the race, as the second Adam, who renounces sin and Satan and makes good the loss incurred through Adam's weakness and guilt. The death of Christ was made to be the most prominent factor in his atoning work.

The Church connected the principle of obedience with faith in the Saviour as its fountain. The new life in the soul of the believer was the spring of righteous action. Yet we have to record an early and an increasing departure from the conception of the life-giving faith which is presented by the Apostle Paul, and the gradual incoming of a more legal spirit. This appears in the distinction between the criminality of sins before and after baptism; the idea of satisfaction to be rendered by the offender, if a communicant; the attaching of merit to good works, such as almsgiving; the notion of works of supererogation, when not only the *commands* of the gospel are obeyed, but *recommendations*, among which virginity was reckoned, are complied with; and, finally, in a tendency to convert faith into a credence given to facts and doctrines, instead of a self-surrender to God and to Christ. A fruit of the same general tendency was the excessive esteem that came to be attached to the intercessory prayers of departed saints, especially of martyrs.

Unity, holiness, and catholicity, the notes of the Church, in process of time were predicated of the visible corporation over which presided the bishops, with the Bishop of Rome at their head. Notes of the Church. "Beyond this visible Church," Cyprian teaches, "there is no salvation." One who dies for the faith, we are told by this father, is not to be called a martyr unless he is within its pale. It is only by Origen and the other teachers of the Alexandrian school that a more spiritual conception of the Church is entertained. Origen says that the words of Jesus to Peter (Matthew xvi. 18) are addressed to that apostle as representing in his confession all believers.

Very early, baptism was so far identified with regeneration as to be designated by this term. This rite was considered essential to salvation. The intention to receive baptism, however, as in

the case of a catechumen who should die before the time fixed for the rite, was accepted as sufficient. A virtue was believed to reside in the baptismal water itself. Baptism was ordinarily administered by the clergy, but where they could not be present, baptism by laymen was not only admissible, but is by Tertullian enjoined.

Baptism and
the Lord's
Supper.

The Asian fathers—Ignatius, Justin, and Irenæus—ascrbe to the Lord's Supper an efficacious influence on the body and spirit of the recipient, having relation to the resurrection and the new and glorified life which he is to receive in connection with it. Christ enters into a mysterious physical union with the bread and wine, through the agency of the Word, or Logos. Yet the bread and wine, in virtue of this hidden power, do not part with their own properties. They remain bread and wine. Literal transubstantiation is a doctrine of much later origin. By the Alexandrians the bread and wine were taken as symbols which bring with them from Christ the spiritual influence which they denote. The habit of looking on the sacrament as an offering, is a fact of signal importance in itself and in its consequences. It is a conception foreign to the New Testament. Yet it is found in the writings of Justin Martyr, and in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles." The bread and wine, with whatever might be bestowed for the poor, were gifts of the flock, and were denominated offerings. Justin regards them as brought to God, yet he nowhere considers the eucharist an offering of the body and blood of Christ. In substantial accord with Justin is Irenæus. But as the notion of the clergy as a priesthood took root, an advance was made beyond this view. Cyprian speaks of the sacrament as a repetition by the Christian priest of the offering of Christ on the cross. Yet he does not define or insist on this view. "In the East," says Harnack, "we possess no proof that before the time of Eusebius there is any idea of the offering of the body of Christ in the Lord's Supper."

The word "sacrament" is used in the Roman sense of an oath. At baptism the Christian takes on him the soldier's vow of fidelity to the Lord. It is used, likewise, in the sense of a sign, or something occult, mysterious, sacred. It is the symbol of an unseen, spiritual reality. This last is the meaning which established itself in the Church.

Sense of the
term "sacra-
ment."

The belief in a millennial kingdom on earth, to follow the second advent of Christ, was widely diffused. In some cases it was conceived of as a scene of material comfort, when the ground would have a miraculous fertility, and its products be proportion-

ately rich. We discern in this millennial expectation traces of the Judaic conception of the Messiah's reign. The Christian doctrine of a millennium differed, however, in regarding his reign on earth as limited in its duration, and as only the prelude to the heavenly state—a state of spiritual blessedness. This millennial or chiliastic belief is found in Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian. The Alexandrians opposed it. They contributed to the overthrow of the tenet, which was also hastened by the unpopularity of Montanism, in which it was a prominent article of belief. At length there arose a great reaction against the chiliastic theory, which spread through the Church.

Many books were written on the subject of the resurrection. It was generally conceived of in a crass and literal way. A more spiritual view, as might be expected, was taken by the Alexandrian school. The soul, it was taught by them, by an inherent vital force, analogous to that which inheres in a grain of wheat, constructs a body akin to its own nature.

It was generally believed that Christ preached the gospel in Hades to the righteous dead of the Old Testament period. This doctrine we find, for example, in Irenæus. Clement of Alexandria made this preaching extend to the Gentile philosophers, who were not averse in their spirit to divine truth, and some interpret him to include, also, the heathen generally, who died without a knowledge of the gospel. Origen thinks that the pious dead were transferred to Paradise, which he makes to be, not a part of Hades, but yet distinct from Heaven. To Paradise believers, as he thought, go at their death. This was contrary to the usual view that they, like the righteous of the Old Testament days, wait in Hades, in a state of happiness, but of happiness not yet perfected, for the general resurrection. It was believed that only martyrs attain at once to the blessed vision of God in heaven. The Alexandrians refer to the purification of departed souls by spiritual fire, or by agencies of which earthly fire is the symbol. The fiery cleansing, however, is placed by Origen at the end of the world, in connection with the judgment.

The prevailing opinion was, that the general judgment is followed by the award of eternal blessedness, and eternal misery.

Certain passages may be quoted, both from Justin Martyr and Irenæus, in which they appear to sanction the idea of an ultimate annihilation of the wicked. But such is not the prevailing view of these writers. What they—Justin, in particular—insist upon is the dependence of the soul for its im-

Chiliasm.

The resurrection.

Hades.

The judgment; retribution.

mortality on the divine will. Origen and his followers hoped for the final restoration of all men to holiness and blessedness. But this was one of the opinions to which he applied the doctrine of reserve: it was not to be broached to the common people, lest they should be released from a fear which was wholesome as long as higher motives were inoperative. Origen did not despair of the redemption of Satan, and of all other fallen spirits.

PERIOD III.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY I. (313-590).

THE SUPREMACY OF THE CHURCH IN THE ROMAN WORLD.

CHAPTER I.

SPREAD OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

SHORTLY after the beginning of the fourth century there occurred an event which, had it been predicted in the days of Nero or even of Decius, would have been deemed a wild fancy. It was nothing less than the conversion of the Roman emperor to the Christian faith. It was an event of momentous importance in the history of the Christian religion. The Roman empire, from being the enemy and persecutor of the Church, thenceforward became its protector and patron. The Church entered into an alliance with the State, which was to prove fruitful of consequences, both good and evil, in the subsequent history of Europe. Christianity was now to reap the advantages and to incur the dangers arising from the friendship of earthly rulers and from a close connection with the civil authority.

The conversion of Constantine.

Constantine was born in 274. He was the son of Constantius Chlorus. His mother, Helena, was of obscure birth. She became a Christian—whether before or after his conversion, is doubtful. He grew up to be a man of imposing presence, of sagacious understanding, and of high administrative ability. In his youth, in the service of Diocletian and Galerius, he showed personal valor and military skill. After the death of Constantine's father, a revolt against Galerius augmented the number of emperors, so that, in 308, not less than six claimed to exercise rule. The contest of Constantine was at first in the West, against the tyrannical and dissolute Maxentius. It was just before his victory over this rival at the Milvian Bridge, near Rome, that he adopted the Christian faith. That there mingled in this decision, as in

most of the steps of his career, political ambition, is highly probable. The strength of the Christian community made it politic for him to win its united support. But he sincerely believed in the God whom the Christians worshipped, and in the help which, through his providence, he could lend to his servants. Constantine showed afterwards in various ways that the old superstitions yet lingered to some extent in his mind. He was never fully weaned from the cultus of Apollo. There were occasions on which he ordered the pagan soothsayers to be consulted. That he did not receive baptism until the day before his death was not due, however, to a lack of faith, but to the current belief, in which he shared, that the holy laver washed out the guilt of all previous sins. Shortly before his victory over Maxentius there occurred what he asserted to be the vision of a flaming cross in the sky, seen by him at noonday, on which was the inscription, in Greek, "By this conquer." It was, perhaps, an optical illusion, the effect of a parhelion beheld in a moment when the imagination, as might be natural at this crisis of his destiny, was strongly excited. He adopted the labarum, or the standard of the cross, which was afterward carried in his armies. In later contests with Licinius, the ruler in the East, who was a defender of paganism, Constantine became more distinctly the champion of the Christian cause. The final defeat of Licinius, in 323, left him the master of the whole Roman world. An edict signed by Galerius, Constantine, and Licinius, in 311, had proclaimed freedom and toleration in matters of religion. The edict of Milan, in 313, emanating from the two latter, established unrestricted liberty on this subject. If we consider the time when it was issued, we shall be surprised to find that it alleges as a motive for the edict the sacred rights of conscience. It implies a doctrine which had to wait many centuries for a practical realization.

Constantine himself did not attempt to put down heathen worship by coercive means. He prohibited, however, all pagan rites which involved immorality, magic, or sorcery. In Constantinople, the "New Rome" which he founded and made his capital, he allowed only Christian worship. But in many ways he used his personal influence, by persuasion and by distributing offices and other rewards, to gain converts to the Christian side. He even delivered discourses to applauding auditors in his palace. He called himself, the historian Eusebius tells us, in relation to the Church, "bishop in externals." This was said in a tone of pleasantry, but it expressed the view which he actually took of his ecclesiastical function. He disclaimed the authority to

Relation of
Constantine
to the Church.

decide questions of orthodoxy. It was his business to take such decisions from the bishops, to protect the Church, and to maintain uniformity in opposition to schismatical parties. He did not, however, always observe this measure of self-restraint in reference to theological disputes. It was inevitable that under such a monarch there should be large reinforcements of the Church from the ranks of the heathen. It was unavoidable, too, that a considerable portion of these new adherents should be actuated by interested motives. Imperial favor, in the room of imperial hostility, was now to be the source of peril to the Church.

During Constantine's reign, the Church in Britain emerges most clearly into view. We read of its being represented at the Council of Arles, in 314, by the Bishops of York, London, and Lincoln. In the reign of Diocletian it was prominent enough to be the object of persecution, though protected, as far as practicable, by Constantius, the father of Constantine.

The origin and development of the early British Church are involved in obscurity. But although history is silent here, the credulity of later generations has never wanted for legends to supply its place. Some of these relate the story of missionary labors of Peter and Paul; others tell of Joseph of Arimathea, of the church he founded at Glastonbury, and of his sanctity, which was so great that a hawthorn bush budded every Christmas-day in his honor.

Setting aside these and like tales as unsupported by evidence, we may safely conjecture that the gospel was carried to Britain soon after the Romans gained a firm foothold there. The progress of Christianity must necessarily have been slow, on account of the bitter antagonism between the military settlements and the wild inhabitants.

In 337, Constantine died, leaving the empire to his unworthy sons. In the division which then took place, the East fell to Constantius; but later, after the death of his brothers, the whole empire was united under his rule. To him the ancient religion seemed politically dangerous. He, therefore, abandoned the moderate policy of his father. He not only renewed the prohibition of sacrifices, but decreed the penalty of death and confiscation of goods against those who refused to comply with its requirements. Many suffered as martyrs, and by their steadfastness and courage brought honor to the cause of the dying religion. Constans, who was for ten years sole emperor in the West, and, after him, Constantius, were obliged to pursue a more cautious policy in that region. The old religion was strong at Rome, especially in the

The old British Church.

Reign of Constantius.

patrician families. On this account the temples of the ancient city were spared and her religious institutions respected. Throughout the empire, after 346, those temples which were prized for artistic beauty escaped destruction, while many of the less noted were demolished amid the plaudits of fanatical bishops. Constantius was an earnest defender of the Arian type of Christianity. He became a persecutor of the orthodox party, and filled his reign with the bitterness of religious strife.

The purity of Christianity had now become corrupted by its brief alliance with the State. A merely formal piety was a pass-
Degeneracy of port to office and imperial favor. The moral tone of the Church.

society was enervated by hypocrisy. The wranglings of bishops over intricacies of doctrine made only more prominent the unchristian lives of the zealous disputants. This condition of things offered the last strong ground of defence to the adherents of the old religion. In the popular estimation, a touch of heroism was given to their cause by the persecuting measures undertaken by the government and promoted by the clergy. This reaction continued to grow in strength until it reached its climax under

The reaction under Julian, 361-363. Julian (called the Apostate), the cousin of Constantius, who obtained the empire in 361. He was fitted by dis-

position and education to be the leader of such a retrograde movement. The destruction of his nearest relatives by the jealousy of his cousin taught Julian to distrust both Constantius and his religion. His eager mind, naturally imaginative, and tinged with sentiment, was crammed with a degenerate Christian doctrine. Even by way of recreation, he had to employ himself in the building of a chapel over the relics of a martyr. He and his brother were educated as ecclesiastics, in order to keep them from ambitious schemes. Sent away from Constantinople by the continued jealousy of Constantius, Julian got leave to pursue his studies at Nicomedia. He there became a pupil of the celebrated rhetorician Libanius, and secretly embraced the ancient faith. He afterwards visited Athens and fell under the influence of the philosophers and rhetoricians there. They filled his mind with projects for restoring the old religious institutions, and taught him to believe himself the providential agent for reasserting the rights of the slighted gods.

As soon as he came to the throne he manifested great zeal in
361. the work to which he felt himself called. As supreme pontiff he was personally, and even ostentatiously, active in conducting ceremonies and offering sacrifices. He proclaimed

toleration to Christianity, but in order to bring it into disrepute he encouraged all sectarian controversies. Ostensibly in the interests of justice, but, perhaps, to foment discord among Christians, he recalled the bishops who had been banished by his predecessor. The temples which had been destroyed by the zealots he ordered to be rebuilt at their expense. He forbade Christians to hold schools of rhetoric, grammar, and the classics, hoping thus to prevent the further spread of Christianity among the educated. Under Constantius the Jews had been oppressed, and therefore under Julian they were favored. Though he condemned their exclusiveness, he praised their worship of a national God. At his command workmen attempted to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem, but were frightened away by a destructive fire that burst out of the vaults below, which was thought to be miraculously kindled. Julian's vain efforts to reverse the order of religious progress passed away with

his life, which ended two years later, when he was engaged in the Parthian expedition.

After Julian's death, Christianity again became dominant in the State. The policy of the next emperors was one of toleration. Jovian (363-364) forbade only those religious rites which were undertaken for the purposes of magic. Nor did Valens (364-378), his successor in the East, go much farther. Those who practised divination and sorcery were looked upon as politically dangerous, and were therefore persecuted. The Western emperor, Valentinian (364-375), was fully tolerant. Yet the old religion lost so rapidly in numbers and influence, that it now received the name of paganism, or peasants' religion. Gratian (375-383), who succeeded his father Valentinian, forsook the moderate policy. He was the first to refuse the robe of Pontifex Maximus. The altar dedicated to Victory, which Julian had restored to its old place in the Roman senate chamber, he caused to be again removed. He took away from the College of Priests the right to receive legacies of real estate. He also deprived the priests and vestals of their support from the public treasury, and confiscated the goods of the temples; and when the remonstrances of the Roman patrician senate were presented, he refused to listen to them. Gratian's successor, Valentinian II. (375-392), urged by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, confirmed these ordinances.

But paganism could no longer seriously alarm those who defended the Christian faith. They were now obliged to face a new danger from the nations hovering on the borders of the empire. The long boundary where the valor of Rome for many generations

had availed as a rampart against the hordes of barbarism, was at last broken through. Marius and Julius Cæsar, Trajan, and Marcus Aurelius, the many heroes, and the disciplined courage of the legions whom they led against the assailants of the republic and the empire, belonged to the past. The tribes of the north burst through the barriers that had long resisted their advance. Marauding incursions were followed by permission given to large bodies to settle in the territories subject to the emperors. These reinforced their weakened armies with numerous barbarian recruits, some of whom rose from the ranks to offices of high command. At length, vast and inexhaustible streams of invaders, flowing from different sources, poured down upon the ancient seats of power and civilization. Into their hands fell the spoils of the cities, of whose opulence and splendor vague rumors, or, it might be, lively pictures, had reached them in their distant forests. It was now to be the task of Christianity to conquer by its ideas, and to elevate by its spirit, these barbarians through whom modern Europe was to derive its being.

The West Goths, a nation which had recently been converted to Arian Christianity, were the vanguard of this mighty host. It is necessary to go back some years in order to narrate the story of their conversion. They were a branch of that great Germanic people which dwelt between the Black and the Baltic Seas. Through their marauding expeditions they first became acquainted with Christianity. The Christian captives whom they carried away from Cappadocia gave them the gospel and made the beginnings of a church. But the great apostle to the Goths was Ulphilas, who was probably a descendant of one of those Cappadocian families. He was made bishop in 343, and had signal success as a preacher among the West Goths. But he could make little progress among the East Goths on account of their hostility to the West Goths. As early as the reign of Constantius, Ulphilas got permission to bring a party of his Gothic Christians, who were suffering persecution, across the Danube, and thus within the limits of the Roman empire. He took up his abode not far from Nicopolis, where he labored as bishop thirty-three years longer. Ulphilas was an Arian from the beginning, and therefore all his converts were Arians. This fact is of great significance, because nearly all the Germanic nations, which from this time began to pour down into the empire, received Christianity from the West Goths, and so, at the outset, professed the Arian doctrine. Ulphilas

Conversion of
the West
Goths.

Ulphilas,
c. 313-383.

355.

gave the Goths a written language, inventing an alphabet based on the Greek, and translated for them the Bible, or large portions of it. In this translation he omitted the books of Kings (including the books of Samuel) in order that his people might not find in them

Moeso-Gothic version. an additional stimulus to their warlike enterprises.

Fragments of this Moeso-Gothic version are the oldest written monument in the Teutonic languages.

In the meantime the persecution of Christians undertaken by Athanaric, still a heathen, had widened the breach between the two divisions of the nation. About the year 370, the Huns began to press upon the East Goths, and, joined by a part of these, to crowd the West Goths down to the Danube. The West Goths now implored Valens to give them an asylum in the Roman territory. It is said that Ulphilas led the embassy. The request was granted, and they crossed the Danube into Mœsia. The avarice of corrupt imperial governors provoked them to revolt. In the battle of Adrianople, which followed, Valens was defeated and killed.

To sustain the tottering empire Theodosius was made regent in the East by Gratian. Theodosius checked the political progress of the Goths by his vigorous military movements. Unlike Theodosius, 379-395. his predecessor, he espoused the cause of the Nicene doctrine of the Trinity, and tried by severe measures to suppress Arianism. A general council was called at Constantinople in 381, which reaffirmed the Nicene doctrine. Ulphilas was summoned by the Emperor to the capital either in that year or in 383. Deeply grieved at the final decision against the Arian tenet, he did not long survive. A confession of faith, composed in his last days, he left to his Goths as his testament. The influence of the teaching of Ulphilas may perhaps be seen in the respect paid to Christians, twenty-seven years later, during the sack of Rome by Alaric, the leader of the West Goths, when all who were, or pretended to be, Christians, were removed to places of safety, and the great churches of St. Peter and St. Paul were protected from the general pillage.

Theodosius instituted harsh and inquisitorial laws in order to crush out the remnants of paganism. With this purpose in view, Persecution of heathenism. he commanded the heathen temples in Asia and Egypt to be closed. The work of suppression which he began, was carried on by violence. Mobs of Christians, instigated by fanatical monks and clergy, began to demolish the temples. In the city of Alexandria a terrible riot occurred, and, driven to desperation, the pagan party intrenched itself about the magnificent temple of

Serapis. The emperor pardoned the rioters, but ordered all the Alexandrian temples to be destroyed. He also proclaimed still severer edicts against the heathen temple service. The policy of Arcadius (395-408), his son and successor in the East, was milder, but the same mob violence prevailed, and did, unpunished, its work of destruction. In the West, Honorius (395-423), his brother, was vacillating in his treatment of paganism. Although at first he commanded the temples in the country places to be destroyed, he afterwards proclaimed general religious freedom. And yet, later in his reign, he caused all pagans to be excluded from offices of state.

The death-blow to paganism at Rome came in 410, when Alaric and his West Goths captured and sacked the city. The shrines of the ancient religion were pillaged, and the patrician families, who were its staunchest supporters, were either destroyed or scattered among the different peoples of the empire. The pagan party had hoped for a new lease of existence from the domination of the heathen barbarians, who a few years before had advanced to attack the city. But the heathen Radagaisus was defeated, while it was the Christian Alaric who was victorious.

The fifth and sixth centuries witnessed great inroads of the barbarians, and thus most important changes of population. The multitude of Suevi, Burgundians, Vandals, and Alans, which perished with Radagaisus in the toils of Stilicho, were but a portion of the confederate nations from which they came. The news of the disaster of their friends moved the host which had been left behind upon the borders of the Rhine, to make an attack upon Gaul. Brief as was the period of their destructive wanderings, it marked the severance of Gaul from the empire.

Alaric's West Goths, who had come to Italy after leaving their home in Mœsia and devastating the fairest region of Thrace and Macedonia, did not long remain enemies of the emperor. Alaric died soon after his capture of Rome. His successor enlisted in the service of Honorius. The West Goths now poured over the Alps into Gaul, and then into Spain, conquering the Alans, chasing the Suevi into the mountains in the northwest, and the Vandals into a district called after them Andalusia. As a reward for their services, the Goths received a district in the southwest of Gaul, bounded by the Loire and Rhone. This territory they soon extended into Spain by conquest. In the meantime, a Burgundian kingdom had been growing up in the southeast. Thus Arianism, for the Bur-

Invasion of
Alaric.

Inroads of
barbarians,
400-600.

Gaul separat-
ed from the
empire, 408

410.

West Goths
in Gaul and
Spain.

Burgundians.

gundians were also Arians, was represented by the most powerful tribes of Gaul and Spain.

The Vandals did not long remain quiet in Spain. In 429 they advanced under Genseric to the conquest of Africa, and wherever their arms were triumphant, there orthodoxy was persecuted and Arianism promoted. To shield his own movements Genseric called in Attila, "the scourge of God," from the north, with his Huns. This wave of ruthless and repulsive barbarism threatened the very existence of Christian civilization.

Vandal conquest of Africa, 429

Defeat of Attila at Chalons, 451.

To beat it back, Rome and the nations of Gaul stood side by side at the great battle of Chalons in 451.

They won the day; but Attila and his host were weakened, not destroyed. The next year they moved down upon the plains of Italy, carrying desolation in their path. Their fury was not checked until the great Bishop of Rome and the imperial ambassadors entered the camp, and by gold and

452.

persuasion turned them back.

But Leo could not in like manner save Rome from Genseric, king of the Vandals, who in 455 carried his victorious arms into Italy. The bishop only succeeded in mitigating the horrors of the pillage.

The Vandals in Rome.

During all these dark days, when Rome and Christian Italy were given over by the weakness of the emperors to the ravages of barbarians, the Roman bishop was fearless in the defence of the city and of the Christians everywhere, who looked to him for protection. While Honorius and his successors were hiding in impregnable Ravenna, he was in Rome, facing all dangers and assuming all responsibilities. Such a prelate was Leo. Wherever duty and the interests of his flock called, he went, regardless of his own safety. He was sober, energetic, enterprising, and inflexible. The sceptre which fell from the feeble hand of the emperor was grasped by him and his successors. Rome in the loss of her old empire found a new and more lasting dominion.

Leo I., 440-461.

410.

Saxon conquest of England, 449.

As early as the reign of Honorius the troops were withdrawn from Britain to meet the needs of the empire. For a time British Christian civilization languished, not being protected from the inroads of the barbarian Picts and Scots. And then came the end. Beginning with 449, vast numbers of Saxons and Angles overran Britain, driving the Britons into Wales and Cornwall. Thus the larger part of the island was given over for several generations to Teutonic heathenism.

About the middle of this century, Ireland received Christianity. The man who carried it thither was Patricius, universally known as St. Patrick. He was born at Banavem, the Roman name of a place in Scotland, south of the Clyde. His name in his own country was Succat. Though his father was a deacon in the village church, Patrick was not converted until the age of sixteen, when, having been carried off by pirates to Ireland, he was put to tending sheep, and, like the prodigal son, "came to himself." After escaping, and passing through various other adventures, he believed himself called, in a vision of the night, to convey the gospel to Ireland. He listened to the divine voice, and went to the people among whom he had once served as a slave. He gathered them about him in the open field and preached to them Christ. His sincere words touched the hearts of peasants and chiefs alike. On the lands which the people gave, he founded monastic communities. Patrick himself was not a learned man, but these monastic societies became centres of learning and devotion, whose influence was felt through the middle ages and in distant parts of the world. But the gospel could not at once subdue the warlike passions of the Irish, and it required all Patrick's influence to hold them in check. His self-denying labors for this people won for him the honors of a patron saint. His name and history were invested with a cloud of legends. Among them—not to speak of the miracles—is the story of a visit to Rome and a connection with the Roman Church. Of all this Patrick himself says nothing in his autobiographical "Confession." The tale of an earlier, wholly abortive mission of a certain Palladius, sent to the Irish from Rome—a tale which may, or may not, be true—has been mingled in a confusing way with the medley of legends concerning Patrick, who makes no mention of him.

Crossing back to the continent again, we find still greater changes going on—some fruitful for good to catholic Christianity, others favorable to the continued power of Arianism. Of the former class, was the conversion of Clovis, king of the Franks, to Christianity. Just before a decisive battle with his enemies, he vowed that if victory were given to him he would worship the God of the Christians, of whom his wife Clotilde was one. Clotilde was the niece of the Burgundian king, who was an Arian; but she was orthodox. After the battle, Clovis, with three thousand of his warriors, was baptized by Remigius, Archbishop of Rheims. Hearing a sermon on the cru-

Conversion of
Ireland.

St. Patrick.

C. 440.

Conversion of
the Franks.

496.

cifixion, the bold chieftain exclaimed that, if he and his faithful Franks had been there, vengeance would have been taken on the Jews. He was a barbarian still, and the new faith imposed little restraint on his ambition and cruelty. But his conversion was an event of the highest importance. The Gallic Church and clergy lent him their devoted support. Since the Franks were destined to become the dominant barbarian people, it was now settled that power was to be in the hands of Catholic—as distinguished from heretical Arian—Christianity. Clovis forced Gundobald, the Burgundian king, to become tributary, and to embrace the Catholic faith. He pressed the Arian West Goths into a narrower strip of territory. He was hailed by the faithful as “most Christian king, and a second Constantine.”

A few years before this, the Roman empire of the West had disappeared. The barbarian Odoacer, leader of the Herulians and other German bands, made himself master of Italy, and accepted the title of Patrician from the Eastern emperor. But he in turn was overthrown by Theodoric, the East Goth, who led his nation from Mœsia into Italy. Though an Arian he respected the Catholics, confirmed the immunities enjoyed by the churches, and generally allowed the Romans to elect their own bishop. In the latter part of the same century, after the Ostro-Gothic kingdom had been overthrown by the forces of Justinian, a new horde of barbarians came down upon the plains of northern Italy. It was the half-heathen, half-Arian Lombards.

In these two centuries, the Church was repeatedly brought face to face with new nations and new types of religious belief—mixtures generally of Arian Christianity and heathenism. These migrating Teutons became subject to the influences of religion in the countries where they settled. The moral force of the Church and of its representative bishops commanded their respect. They could not escape altogether a sentiment of awe in the presence of the Christian priest. They could not avoid feeling in some measure the softening and restraining influence of Christian teaching, and learning the lessons of the cross. Nevertheless, the religious condition of the West, the character of the Church and of the clergy, could not fail to be powerfully affected for the worse by the influx of barbarism and the corrupting influence of barbarian rulers. A great deterioration in the Church and in its ministry ensued after the generation contemporary with the Germanic conquests passed away.

While all these years with their storms and convulsions had come and gone in the West, little of world-wide interest had occurred in the history of Greek Christianity. The principal support of heathenism, which was propagated in secret, was the New Platonic school at Athens. Under Justinian, the lectures were forbidden and the school broken up. The teachers fled to Persia, hoping to find a place there for themselves and their religious ideas. But Parsism was as distasteful to them as Christianity. They returned from their exile, only to sink into obscurity. Thus it was that scarcely two hundred years after the conversion of Constantine the power of paganism had vanished. The ancient religions of the peoples united under Rome had given way to a better faith. The superstitions of the barbarians, who had found homes in the empire, had been exchanged for a more wholesome belief. But Christianity had done more than this. It had extended its influence to the distant East and South, to Abyssinia, and the tribes of the Syrian and Lybian deserts, to Armenia, Persia, and India.

In Persia it had peculiar difficulties to overcome. Zoroastrianism, with its two divine principles—Ormuzd, the good, and Ahri-man, the evil—was a more powerful foe than the grosser forms of heathenism. The Persians accused the Christians of blasphemy, since they made the good God the creator of that which is evil. They were also offended because the monks seemed to despise riches and children, which in their estimation were the special gifts of Ormuzd. Moreover, the Persian government suspected Christians of being disaffected citizens and favorable to Roman pretensions. In 343, it began a fierce persecution which aimed at their complete extermination. From this time the Persian Church had little rest until after the Nestorian controversy had separated it from the orthodox Church of the Greek empire, and thus had relieved it from political suspicion.

It is probable that during this time merchants and refugees from Persia carried the gospel to India. Cosmas Indicopleustes, a traveller of the sixth century, found three churches there—one in Ceylon, one on the Malabar coast, and one at Calcutta.

The Armenians received Christianity more universally than the Persians. It had been introduced among them as early as the second century. At the beginning of the fourth, Gregory, "The Illuminator," diffused it more widely. Tiridates, the king, as well as great numbers of his subjects, were

converted. Later, in their struggles to resist the aggressions and persecutions of the Persians, they defended their Christian faith with fortitude and perseverance. Despite the rapid progress of Christianity in this period, the great countries to the north of the Rhine and the Danube, as well as Teutonic Britain, had not yet received the light of the gospel. To carry the gospel to them was the work of succeeding centuries.

CHAPTER II.

CHANGES OF ORGANIZATION : ADVANCEMENT OF THE ROMAN SEE.

THE purity of Christianity and the simplicity of its nature had been obscured in the preceding period by the growth of the theocratic idea. It was now exposed to new dangers from its alliance with worldly power and its subjection to imperial influence. The accession of Constantine found the Church so firmly organized under the hierarchy that it could not lose its identity by being absolutely merged in the state. But since there was no clearly understood principle defining the respective spheres of Church and State, the first Christian emperor and his successors exercised a large measure of control in ecclesiastical affairs. They assumed to fill, on their own authority, the highest episcopal offices. They convoked general councils, and presided over them by their representatives, and published conciliar decrees as laws of the empire. Some of the later Greek emperors even went so far as to exercise the right to decide on disputed points of doctrine. Such usurpations were made possible by the ardent desire of each theological party to enlist the political power on its side and thus to overwhelm its opponents.

The Eastern Church, by its character and situation, was more exposed to these evils. It was in close contact with the schemes and officials of the court. Its strength was exhausted by incessant conflicts and intestine doctrinal divisions. The minds of the clergy became infected with ambition and servility. They resorted to the methods of political intrigue to further their worldly interests. The Church in the West had more sobriety and firmness of character. It had a stronger and more consistently developed hierarchical organization, which, in conjunction with its distance from Constantinople, protected it from some of the dangers of imperial favor. Hence, in this period,

The Eastern
and the West-
ern Churches.

the Western Church, on the whole, grew more independent, while the Eastern Church gradually became enslaved to the state.

The emperors endeavored to promote the interests of Christianity by their personal influence, and by giving to the Church and its clergy new legal rights, somewhat analogous to those previously enjoyed by the heathen priesthood. A few of the churches which Constantine built, received revenues from the public funds, while to others were given the treasures of confiscated temples. Ecclesiastical property now rapidly accumulated. The Church was made the heir of all clergymen who died without leaving wills. The right to receive legacies became, on account of the piety and superstition of the times, a fruitful source of wealth. This right was, however, so abused that Valentinian I. (364-375) found it necessary to make a law protecting women and minors from the avarice of the monks and the clergy. The offices of the Church were turned by many into a means of personal enrichment.

The relief from burdensome civil duties, and from various forms of taxation, which Constantine granted to the clergy, led a multitude of individuals of the higher classes, who were possessed of wealth, to assume a clerical office, even though it were of a subordinate rank. Constantine, seeing the danger of this practice to the state, provided that new clergymen should be appointed only in place of those dying; and these recruits were not to be taken from the noble families nor from families of wealth. Such a law was necessarily as hurtful to the Church as the previous law was to the state. Therefore, in 383, a new law was enacted, which allowed anyone to enter the clerical office, but provided that those who were obliged by their wealth and rank to bear civil burdens should first resign their property to others.

The jurisdiction which, voluntarily conceded, the Church and its bishops had exercised over church members was now put on a legal basis. In ecclesiastical affairs, and in civil cases referred to them by the consent of both parties, as well as in all causes between clergymen, the decisions of the bishops were made final. These multiplying duties threatened to become an intolerable burden to conscientious prelates. Some of them complained that they were compelled to spend too much of their time merely in settling disputes; while others, more worldly-minded, enjoyed their increasing influence in secular affairs. There was a growing tendency to establish the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts over all cases in which a clergyman was in-

The emperors
favor the
Church.

Laws respect-
ing the ap-
pointing of
the clergy.

The legal ju-
risdiction of
bishops.

volved. This tendency became so strong that in the next period even criminal suits, in which the clergy were concerned, were remanded by Heraclius to these courts.

But the ministers of religion were able to promote the cause of justice and humanity. The churches were made asylums in which

Courage of the clergy. the hunted slave or the fallen minister of state might take refuge until the clergy could intercede to mitigate the rigor of justice, and to protect the innocent and unfortunate in a nobler way. Acknowledged as superintendents of public morals, the clergy were many times fearless in the rebuke of rude out-

Theodosius, d. 395. breaks of despotism and oppression. Even the emperor Theodosius was compelled by Ambrose, Bishop of Milan,

to do penance for a massacre perpetrated in Thessalonica by his orders, in revenge for the slaying of a military governor in a riot. By the intercessions of Flavianus, Bishop of Antioch, that city was protected from the vengeance of the same emperor. On other occasions, bishops were found to emulate, in dealing with hostile rulers, the example of John the Baptist. Athanasius did

336. not fear to address Constantine, as he was passing on horseback through the principal street of Constantinople; "and the haughty spirit of the emperor was awed by the courage and eloquence of a bishop who implored his justice and awakened his conscience." Basil, the great Bishop of Cæsarea, sent back a spirited and severe reply to a threatening message of Julian; and

371. long afterwards faced, with an undaunted courage that secured his safety, first Modestus, the commissioner of Valens, and then the Arian emperor himself.

In accordance with the theocratic idea, the priesthood was more and more regarded as representing the visible Church, as the link

Exaltation of the clergy. between the kingdom of God on earth and its divine head, and as the channel through which the Holy Spirit was communicated to the world. There was growing up a strong feeling that the clergy should stand aloof from secular life, and exhibit a higher form of morality than was required of the common Christian. The clergyman was thus set over against the layman: there were two ideals of Christian life. This contrast tempted the one to a false pride in his superior sanctity, and the other to a dangerous contentment in mere external morality.

Through the influence of Church councils, and of such leaders as Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine, the doctrine that Celibacy. the clergy of the three higher grades should remain unmarried became widely recognized. And yet it met with much

opposition in the West, while in the East its progress was hindered by the arguments and example of pious and respected bishops.

The duties of the clergy were conceived of, as well as their lives judged, too much by an outward, unspiritual standard. The tendency was to think that ordination conferred in some magical way all needed abilities. Such ideas were especially prevalent in the West, and thus it came about that education was discredited, notwithstanding the influence in an opposite direction of such men as Augustine. In the West there were no theological schools, and but few cloisters, and, except in the single case of the North African bishops, the clergy had to submit to no examinations. To make up, as far as possible, for these defects, Augustine, and others who were imbued with a like spirit, gathered their clergy about them in the same dwelling and at a common table. The outlook in the East was better. There the traditions of the ancient Greek culture had not lost their influence. There, also, were the great theological schools of Alexandria and Antioch, as well as many cloisters, which furnished a valuable, though often narrow education. On the whole, however, the common school of a clergyman was his practical training in the lower clerical offices. But this advantage was by no means always used, despite various laws which provided that candidates for the higher offices should rise, step by step, from the position of prelector or reader.

There were many irregularities in the appointment of the clergy, especially in the East. Sometimes men of unusual popularity or marked fitness were called directly from secular life to the office of bishop. Although this was in violation of the ordinary rules of the Church, it was not in all cases injurious. When Gregory of Nazianzus, resigned the bishopric of Constantinople, Nectarius, who had the rank of senator, was, at the suggestion of the Bishop of Tarsus, appointed by Theodosius to fill the vacant office. He had not even been baptized, and while wearing the white robe of a neophyte was proclaimed bishop. Occasionally by this sort of irregularity the people were enabled to exercise their ancient right to take part in the choice of the clergy. A most notable example of this occurred when the people of Milan, by acclamation, called Ambrose to be their bishop. He was then only a catechumen, and had not been baptized. Yet in eight days he was seated on the episcopal throne. The right of the congregation, however, though it was not taken away during the present period, was gravely impaired. When there was a vacant clerical office it was the duty of the bishop to make a nomi-

Education of
the clergy.

Appointment
of the clergy.

381.

nation, which the people were to accept or reject. But the bishop often made appointments for the inferior offices without consulting the people. The choice of a bishop, when the emperor did not interfere, depended for the most part on the clergy of the province, but the consent of the people was required, which in the West was no mere form. Many of the clergy, especially in the East, filled with ambitious schemes, aspired to places in the capital, or sought for churches of similar distinction. Their attempts to override the laws against transference from one church to another occasioned much strife and bitterness. Others frequently left their parishes, ostensibly on some errand of mercy, and journeyed to the court, in whose life they so delighted to mingle. This episcopal absenteeism became so prevalent that the councils of Antioch (341) and Sardica (343) were obliged to pass stringent laws against it.

The primitive identity of bishops and presbyters was being rapidly forgotten. The bishops, as the successors of the Apostles, Ranks of the clergy. were coming to be considered the pillars and witnesses of the truth, and the vehicles for the conveyance of the Holy Spirit to the lower orders of the clergy. They only could confirm, and consecrate with the holy oil. By their authority and ordination the presbyters and deacons were enabled to fulfil spiritual functions. They presided over the assemblies of the clergy and cared for the administration of church property. Next below them came the presbyters, and below these, in turn, were the deacons. In many places, however, the deacons, especially the archdeacons, being nearer the person of the bishop, endeavored to assume a position above the presbyters. In general it was their duty to assist the higher clergy in the religious services. The repeating of certain prayers and the reading of the Gospels were assigned to them, while other portions of Scripture, as subordinate, were assigned to prelectors. During this period the office of deaconess lost its importance. It was discontinued in the West, but lingered in the East until the twelfth century. There were added various inferior offices, which greatly swelled the ranks of the clergy. The first of these was the *æconomus*, or steward. It was his duty to guard the church property against embezzlement, and to have a certain oversight over its administration by the bishop, as well as to care for it during all vacancies in the episcopal office. The civil suits in which the Church found itself involved compelled it to employ an advocate, who at first was a clergyman, but afterwards frequently a lawyer. Out of the desire of each church to keep a record of the trials

of its martyrs grew up the office of *notarius*, or recorder, who was generally a deacon, and whose duty it became in later times to make a full report of the proceedings of councils. With the clergy are also to be reckoned those who were appointed to attend the sick and bury the dead. Their number increased so rapidly that in such large cities as Alexandria and Antioch it had to be limited by law.

The hierarchical organization gradually became perfected. Not only were all the bishops exalted above the presbyters, but certain bishops who were in charge of churches distinguished by their situation, or by their superior claim to be the custodians of apostolic tradition, were placed in authority over their less favored brethren. The country bishops lost first their prerogatives and then their existence. In 343 the Council of

Building up
of the hier-
archy.

Country
bishops.

Sardica ordained that they should not be appointed in the small towns, on the ground that presbyters were sufficient. According to the provisions of a later council, visiting presbyters were to be sent to these country churches to look after their welfare. Thus these congregations became affiliated with the neighboring city churches and were called parishes. This term was of varying signification, but it finally denoted simply the country communities. As Christianity spread in the cities it became impossible to accommodate all worshippers in one church. Each new church was, however, affiliated to the mother church, over which the bishop presided. Often it had its own presbyter, subject to the bishop, but in some cases it was ministered to by presbyters who officiated by turns. The bishop of the chief city of each province was called the metropolitan. He exercised a

Metropoli-
tans.

general supervision over the churches of his province. With the assistance of the provincial clergy he ordained the bishops. It was also his duty to call and preside over synods, as well as in the ecclesiastical courts in which accusations against a bishop were tried. Among these metropolitans, those of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria were distinguished, even in the preceding period, by having the care of several provinces. Although this arrangement was approved by the Council of Nicea, yet the provincial synods were acknowledged as the highest ecclesiastical tribunals. In the Arian controversies, however, these provincial synods were found too weak, and large hierarchical organizations were brought into being. In the East the lines of the dioceses into which Constantine had divided the empire were followed. The bishop of the chief city in each diocese was, therefore, raised above all other metropolitans,

The large
dioceses.

although his rights varied in the different dioceses. They were greatest in that of Egypt, of which Alexandria was the capital. In the diocese of Thrace, the newly founded Constantinople naturally became the capital in place of Heraclea. This diocesan arrangement was approved by the Council of Constantinople, and diocesan synods, as the highest ecclesiastical courts, were placed above the provincial councils. This same council gave to the Bishop of Constantinople the first rank among these diocesan bishops, his station being second only to that of Rome. Supported by political influences, the bishops of the great capital established a control over the neighboring dioceses of the Bishops of Ephesus and Neo-Cæsarea. The later Council of Chalcedon, in 451, recognized this arrangement, and conferred, in addition, the right to receive appeals and complaints from the whole Eastern Church. New Rome was thus placed on a level with ancient Rome in real power, though a little below it in titular dignity. This action of the Council of Chalcedon was the source of a long and bitter contest between the rival sees.

About this time, the name Patriarch, which had previously been a name of respect applied to every bishop, was appropriated exclusively to the bishops of the great sees of Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, and Antioch. To this rank Jerusalem also was now raised by the decree of the Council of Chalcedon, not because of its actual influence, but on account of its historic dignity.

While there were four patriarchates in the East, no one of which could long dominate the other three, there was but one in the West, and that one, even at the beginning of this period, the most important of them all. Rome had an ecclesiastical supremacy over ten suburbicarian provinces, comprising Italy, south of the northern boundary of Etruria, and Sicily, Sardinia, Corsica, and Valeria. But its real power was by no means so circumscribed. As an apostolic Church of loftiest rank, its counsel had been received during the preceding period with reverence in all the West, many of whose churches it had founded. Its very name suggested the glories of the old republic and of the Augustan empire. Its influence gradually became more powerful, and its jurisdiction was being slowly but surely extended over the whole Western Church. The Council of Sardica, in 347, gave to Julius, the Roman bishop, the privilege of appointing judges to try the cases of condemned bishops, if he thought their appeals worthy of consideration. He could institute a revision of the verdicts of synods, even

A.D. 381.

Elevation of
the see of
Constantino-
ple.The patri-
archates.Exaltation of
Rome.

though no appeal were made to him. This honoring of the memory of the Apostle Peter in the person of Julius proved dangerous to the liberty of the churches. The decrees which, on the ground assigned, had given such privileges to Julius, as well as the grants made by the emperor Gratian to a subsequent bishop, were claimed as conferring a permanent authority on the bishops of Rome; and since, by mistake, they were afterwards taken for decrees of the Nicene council, their influence was much increased. Quoted as Nicene decrees, they were used with effect in a controversy with the North African Church, in the first years of the next century. But the North Africans resisted the claim of judicial authority set up by Innocent I. (402-417), and afterwards forbade all appeals to foreign bishops. Soon, however, the confusion and distress brought in by the Vandal ascendancy gave Leo I. (440-461) an occasion for re-asserting Rome's jurisdiction.

The doctrinal controversies which continually agitated the East after the Nicene council tended to elevate the Roman see. Each party flew to it for support, and made use of flattering language, which the Roman bishops literally interpreted and persisted in quoting after the controversy that gave rise to it had died out. In the controversy on the divinity of Christ, Julius espoused the cause of Athanasius; and although his interference was resented by the Eastern prelates, still the influence of Rome was increased rather than diminished, since the party favored by Rome eventually gained the victory. In critical moments, also, the Roman bishop interposed with doctrinal formulas, which met with general acceptance. The most memorable instance was at Chalcedon, when the statement of the creed relative to the person of Christ was substantially drawn from the letter of Leo. The

Leo I. and the
Council of
Chalcedon.

Eastern bishops were accustomed to defer to the advice of the patriarch of the West on the ground of Rome's historic preëminence. But in the Roman Church the idea of its supremacy, as based on the primacy of Peter, was rapidly acquiring definite form and resolute support. This idea took complete possession of the mind of Leo, a bishop who had great influence in establishing the pretensions of the Roman see. When the Council of Chalcedon, in giving equal privileges to the Bishop of Constantinople, assumed that the high rank of the Roman bishop arose out of the fact that Rome was the ancient capital of the empire, Leo spurned the idea. He claimed that the Bishop of Rome was the successor of Peter, the chief of the Apostles and vicar of Christ. On this occasion he wrote to the emperor: "Without that rock [the Apostle Peter]

which our Lord has wonderfully laid as the foundation, no structure can stand." But Leo did not renounce the advantage to be derived from the political position of Rome. He skilfully interwove this with the more vital consideration just named. He claimed that the Roman Empire was built up with reference to Christianity, and that Rome, for this reason, was chosen for the bishopric of the chief of the Apostles. Inspired by this idea, he uttered a striking prophecy: he foretold that her spiritual conquests and dominion would surpass in glory all that her temporal power had gained.

Leo's administration.

Leo improved every opportunity to bring to pass the early fulfilment of this prediction. He attempted to reinstate a bishop who had been deposed by Hilary, Metropolitan of Southeast Gaul. Incensed at what he termed the obstinate disobedience of Hilary, he overstepped the privileges granted to Julius by the Council of Sardica, reinstated the bishop without a trial, and transferred the metropolitan rights from Arles to Vienne. Hilary, however, continued to enjoy the same dignities as before. There-

445. upon Valentinian III. issued a law by which the Roman bishop was declared the supreme head of the Western Church. This law gave for its reasons—the primacy of Peter, the dignity of the city, and the decree of a holy synod. Resistance to the authority of the Roman bishop was affirmed to be an offence against the Roman State. No bishops in Gaul could undertake anything without the consent of the *Papa urbis æternæ*. Leo successfully maintained Rome's authority in another quarter. The East Illyrian bishops, who during the Arian controversies had come under her protection, became discontented with the domination of the Metropolitan of Thessalonica, and sought to be received into the diocese of the Patriarch of Constantinople. Leo not only reconciled them to their superior, but also made his influence felt more directly in their affairs.

Political changes in Italy had much to do with the growth of the papacy. In 404 Honorius fixed his residence at Ravenna, on the

border of the Adriatic, where also his successors resided, as well as the Gothic kings and the Eastern exarchs, who ruled after the breaking up of the Western empire.

From this time the danger from the proximity of the civil ruler and the influences of court life, the peril to which the Eastern Church was constantly exposed, passed away. Except during Justinian's brief domination in Italy, the civil power no longer seriously interfered with the development of the prerogatives of the Roman bishop. At the same time, more opportunities were afforded for making his

Political situation favors the papacy.

authority felt in the affairs of the city and of the surrounding districts.

The barbarian princes, and especially Theodoric, conceded to the bishops of Rome a large degree of liberty as long as a bitter rivalry parted them from the bishops of Constantinople. He had no reason to fear a hierarchical combination against him. Even in a disputed election he did not interpose until called upon, and then permitted the party of Symmachus in their synod to declare that all interference on the part of laymen was inadmissible. During this same controversy, Ennodius, a member of the synod summoned to try the charges against Symmachus, made the significant declaration that it was the divine will that the Bishop of Rome should be judged by God alone. By their steady adherence to the orthodox creeds the Roman bishops continued to rise in the estimation of the Church, and to gain more favor for their pretensions. But as yet they claimed no new or peculiar dignities; they only demanded the recognition of their right to judge in the case of faults committed by bishops.

During the Byzantine rule over Italy, the Roman bishops fell temporarily from their position of dignity and independence.

The Roman bishops under Byzantine rule. They were treated by Justinian as on a level with the bishops of Constantinople, and were coerced into a support of his doctrinal preferences. They now forsook their former consistent adherence to the decisions of orthodox councils and became involved in the Monophysite heresies, vacillating from one side to another. It seemed as though Rome was to lose her good name and to forfeit her controlling influence in the West. Some of the Italian churches even broke off communion with her. It was the heretical Lombards who saved Rome for orthodoxy and rendered her future greatness possible. They did it by breaking the power of the exarchate, the Greek dominion in Italy. Although the bishops of Rome were still in name subject to the Eastern emperor, they were fast becoming practically independent. Italy now learned to look to them for the protection which its nominal rulers could not or would not afford.

Effect of the Lombard conquest on the papacy. The name Papa (Pope), applied elsewhere in the West as a title of honor to all bishops, and in the East as a special title of the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, became in Italy, as early as the beginning of the sixth century, the exclusive designation of the bishops of Rome.

The term "Pope." The codification of ecclesiastical laws had a decided effect in

increasing the strength of the hierarchy. The first satisfactory collection of this kind was made by the monk Dionysius Exiguus, about the year 500. His book contained the decretals of the popes from the time of Siricius, the decrees of the general or œcumenical councils, and the most important canons of the provincial synods.

The controversy concerning Church discipline, which had been maintained in the former period by the Novatians, was revived in the early years of the fourth century by the Donatists. They declared, in general, that a rigid discipline was necessary to preserve the purity of the Church, and, in particular, that it was wrong to receive back to the communion of the faithful any who had denied Christ under persecution. These opinions were coupled with an extravagant veneration for martyrs, and an intense conviction that their opponents were corrupters of the Church. They were declared

314. by the Synod of Arles to be schismatics and were subjected to persecution. Bands of fanatical monks and peasants took up their cause, and became the terror of many districts of Africa. In the next century a disputation was

411. held at Carthage, at which Augustine vainly tried to convince the more reasonable members of the Donatist party. After this time they struggled on for many years until they were finally overwhelmed by imperial troops. The party which favored a milder discipline had triumphed. Even the worst sinners, if contrite, might now be restored to the fellowship of the Church. The steps in the process of penance were systematically arranged. The confession of private sins was not required, and, therefore, when made it was regarded as a hopeful token of repentance, and was rewarded with the mitigation of the ordinary punishment. Those penitents whose lives had been notoriously sinful were to follow the directions of the bishop or the penitentiary presbyter, if there was one, as was frequently the case in the large Eastern cities. But in 390, owing to certain scandals, this office was abolished by the Patriarch of Constantinople, and thenceforward penance was left to be apportioned by the conscience of the individual. Discipline fell somewhat into decay in the West also, although it was still believed that forgiveness was conditioned upon confession. The outward manifestation was prized as highly as the inward spirit that was always, at least in theory, supposed to prompt it.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP.

WHEN Christianity was made the religion of the empire, it became also the fashion of a luxurious and decaying society. With weakened forces it confronted the peculiar difficulties and temptations of its new position. Its vital principles, being overlaid by ideas that were foreign to their nature, had become partially obscured. The pure and steady light of a true Christian life which should have shone abroad over the darkness and confusion of the world, was dimmed by a formal and churchly piety, or made ghostly by an unearthly asceticism.

Decline of
vital Chris-
tianity.

Growth of
formalism.

The Christian life of the period, being released from the restraints of persecution, was left free to develop according to the tendencies which had previously begun to make themselves felt. It was now exposed to many subtle, debasing influences from within and without the Church. As it is natural to expect during the decay of one religion and the rise of another, atheism and demoralization were widespread. The prevalent unspiritual views of the gospel made it possible for multitudes of heathen to pass from the old religion to the new by no other conversion than a mere change of name. To them the Christian life seemed nothing deeper than a round of ceremonies and perfunctory duties. Many sought by almsgiving and by partaking of the communion to atone for sinful lives. They saw in baptism an easy means of rescue from perdition, and hence they deferred resorting to the holy laver until frightened by the approach of death. Like their pagan ancestors, they ridiculed and persecuted the more conscientious who endeavored to lead lives of sincere piety. The delusion of such nominal believers was fostered by the growing distinction between the sort of piety required of the monks and the clergy, and that demanded of the ordinary Christian. Even the great theologians and preachers of the fourth century, who withstood the evil tendencies of the age, were not altogether free from the influence of the same unspiritual notions. And yet despite all this, the nobler Christian ideal was kept alive in the hearts of many individuals. Its most beautiful manifestation was seen in the mothers of some of the greatest and best of the Church teachers. And it is to the lives of Nonna, Anthusa, and Monica that the

Church owes much of what Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Augustine were and accomplished.

The ascetic tendency became so strong in the Church life of this period that it engendered a monasticism highly developed in its various phases. The monastic spirit has not been confined to the history of Christianity. It was found among the Jews and culminated in the Essenes. In a still more advanced form it spread among the followers of Buddha and the worshippers of Serapis. Whenever there is present in the mind of man that mystical longing for an uninterrupted enjoyment of the inward experiences of the soul, a passion for self-brooding, and an unhealthy view of the seclusion requisite for the true religious life, some form of monasticism will emerge. Especially will this be the fact in countries where the climate is mild and favorable to repose. The causes of the development of monasticism in this period are not far to seek. The state of the times stimulated a desire for ascetic retirement. The world was falling to pieces morally as well as politically. The sky was dark and threatening. The purity of the Church was imperiled by the influx of nominal Christianity. A feeling of alarm took possession of many serious minds. Some who lacked the courage to enter into conflict with the growing depravity looked for a secure retreat from the vanities and uncertainties of ordinary life. Others, and among them not a few noble minded men, wrongly apprehending the relation of the Christian to the world, thought that the true conquest of an evil world was to be achieved by withdrawing from it.

The native hearthstone of monasticism, as we have already explained on a previous page, was in the East, and especially in Egypt, where paganism had developed similar tendencies. The ascetic no longer resorted to the neighborhood of churches or lingered on the borders of villages, as in the former period. He withdrew to the solitudes of the desert, or sought an abode in a cavern of the mountains. From this circumstance, such monks received the name of "anchorites," which comes from a Greek word meaning to retire.

Their patron saint and reputed founder was Anthony, whose life, said to have been written by Athanasius, is still preserved.

The story of Anthony, however much or little of it may be due to the imagination of those times, no doubt presents an ideal of the hermit's life in the fourth century. Anthony was from boyhood of a reflective and religious nature. The death of his parents threw upon him, while still a youth, the care of a

Sources of
monasticism.

The hermits.

Anthony of
Thebes.

younger sister, and the vexations incident to the affairs of a large estate. He was troubled by all these distracting earthly concerns, and hastened to obey the command of Jesus to the rich young man, reserving only a small amount of property for the use of his sister. Again the Scripture seemed to speak to him in the precept, "take no thought for the morrow." He therefore disposed of the remainder of his estate, and placed his sister in a society of virgins. His love, which still went out toward her, he tried to stifle, because he thought all such affections in one who had abjured the world, unholy. Aged ascetics for a time became his only companions and teachers. He then resorted to a cave in the mountains, there to give himself to pious contemplation and to the conquest of the evil propensities of his nature. The very desires which he wished to crucify, grew strong and multiplied in his morbid fancies. Evil spirits wrestled with him and left him fainting and wounded. As these years of solitary struggle passed away, he began to become known; and in order to avoid publicity, he retired again and again to deeper solitudes. Many sought him out even in these hidden retreats, and took counsel of him in reference to the ascetic life. He warned them against the errors of his own early experience, telling them to occupy their minds with good thoughts and healthful work, and thus rid themselves of evil imaginations. In his admonitions he was wise and charitable. He was neither servile before the great nor proud before the humble. The word which he sent to the emperors was an exhortation to do justice and to remember the poor. On two or three occasions of peculiar peril he appeared in Alexandria, either to encourage the faithful under persecution or to resist the progress of Arian heresy. His humility lasted to the end. When death was near, he ordered his sepulchre to be concealed that his body might not be an object of reverence.

The life of Anthony, be it historical or mythical, may be taken as a picture of the course pursued by the better class of anchorites. They rapidly increased in numbers and spread their cells over the desolate and secluded regions of Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. They subjected themselves to every form of physical privation and suffering, often devising curious and extravagant modes of self-torture. The most notable of them was Simeon the Stylite, so called because he took up his abode on the top of a pillar. From this lofty position, sixty feet from the ground, he preached to those whom curiosity and admiring devotion gathered about him.

Many anchorites, who became widely revered for sanctity, were

honored and addressed by men of distinction as their spiritual fathers. Pupils listened to their teachings, and thus small monkish communities grew up around them.

Influence of
anchorites.

But, independently of this effect, a movement toward the cloister life was made by Pachomius. On an island in the Upper Nile he formed the monks into a society. This was first called a *cœnobium*—a term signifying “common life.”

Cloister life.

It was applied later to each single cloister. Pachomius and his successors became abbots, or, as these were styled by the Greeks, archimandrites, of the principal cloister, with full authority over all others connected with it. The monks were divided into classes, according to the measure of their spiritual development; and to each class were assigned its peculiar duties. They employed themselves, for the most part, in making baskets and in agricultural labors. The fruits of their work were received by the steward of the cloister, who was under the supervision of the chief steward of the whole organization. All the profits from the sale of their wares were given to the poor. These cloisters multiplied rapidly. Soon similar establishments were founded for women.

The most influential among the promoters of Eastern monasticism was Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea. In his youth, when a student at Athens, he was intimately associated with Gregory of Nazianzus. The two friends, pondering the question what course they should follow, resolved to take orders and to choose a life of celibacy and poverty. Then they considered the question whether they should become hermits or lead a more public life, the life of the “secular.” They determined on a course midway between the two, such as was adopted by the *cœnobites*. This passage in their early lives is described in lines of Gregory, as translated by Cardinal Newman :

Basil, c.
330-379.

“ Long was the inward strife, till ended thus :
I saw, when men lived in the fretful world,
They vantaged other men, but missed the while
The calmness, and the pureness of their hearts.
They who retired held an uprighter post,
And raised their eyes with quiet strength toward heaven ;
Yet served self only, unfraternally.
And so, ’twixt these and those, I struck my path,
To meditate with the free solitary,
Yet to live secular, and serve mankind.”

Gregory, partly on account of filial obligations, and partly owing to peculiarities of temperament, had less experience of the se-

cluded life. But Basil carried out the ideal thus early formed. He became the guide of others who were attracted to the cloister by his influence and example. His *rule*, or system of regulations, was characterized by good sense and moderation. He condemned the solitary life and urged the necessity of industrious habits. The cœnobites were exposed to fewer dangers and temptations than were the anchorites. These extreme ascetics naturally believed that their greater privations won for them a higher degree of merit in the sight of God. They were often driven by the silence and gloom of a solitary life, or by the excessive heat of a tropical sun, into insanity. The cœnobites suffered from like causes, although to a far less extent. Many monks passed through violent and morbid reactions of feeling. From lives of extravagant self-denial they plunged into the wildest excesses. Some became lawless fanatics, like the fierce monks who mixed in the Nestorian controversy, or, like the circumcellions in North Africa, who took up the cause of the persecuted Donatists. Certain mystical sects arose, claiming to have attained to the highest perfection. The most prominent of these were the *Euchites*. They believed themselves to be freed from the dominion of sense by a state of inward prayer. They renounced all forms of manual labor, and wandered about like the mendicant friars of a later age.

The evils and excesses incident to the solitary life of the anchorites led many, including Jerome, to condemn it. They advocated the cloister life, where the monks might receive the wholesome counsels of a superior and might better cultivate the spirit of Christian love toward their brethren. It was also felt to be necessary to check the irregularities of the monks and to bring them more under episcopal supervision.

Monasticism grew up in the West much more slowly than it did in the East. It found zealous advocates in Jerome, Ambrose, and Augustine. Early in the fifth century, John Cassian, who came from the East, founded a cloister at Marseilles. In the same century, monasticism appeared in other parts of Gaul, and in Britain and Ireland. Of all these settlements the noblest and most beneficial was the Scottish cloister on the island of Iona.

Inasmuch as the mental qualities of the Western nations differed from those of the Eastern, monasticism in the West was modified in certain of its phases, and in other features was more fully developed. The people of the West were less given to mystical speculation. A more crude imagination clothed their supersti-

tious fancies in material forms, and prepared them to see miracles at every turn. They were kept, by the greater rigor of the Western climate, from many of the extravagances of Eastern asceticism. And yet even Western anchorites made their abode in some weird cleft of the volcanic rocks of Italy, or on the lonely shore of the sea.

Benedict was for the West the ideal monk, and into the story of his life his disciples delighted to weave wonderful and supernatural elements. In the later years of the fifth century, while a mere boy, he was taken to Rome to be educated. Shocked at the spectacle of the vices of mankind, he suddenly left the city, attended only by a faithful nurse, who had discovered his purpose. Soon after, he eluded her also, and hid himself in a cavern near Subiaco. Here Satan tormented him with temptations, trying, without success, to break his pious resolution. By the invitation of some neighboring monks, he became abbot of their monastery. But they soon learned to hate him on account of his rigorous discipline, and were kept only by a miracle from poisoning him. He now went back to his former abode, which the fame of his sanctity changed from a solitude into a cluster of monasteries. Not yet satisfied, he turned his steps towards Monte Cassino, fifty miles away, on the heights of the Apennines. There he put an end to the pagan worship, and founded the monastery which had so universal an influence in the West as an incentive to the monastic life and a pattern in its organization. Benedict's regulations enjoined upon his monks a life of strict silence, humility, and implicit obedience. Their hours of labor, their diet, and their religious exercises, were carefully and systematically arranged. The disciples of Benedict, the most notable of whom was Maurus (St. Maur), spread his order into Gaul and Sicily. Its cloisters sprang up everywhere. The monks taught the barbarians the art of agriculture and kept alive the light of knowledge. To the weary traveller they always offered a ready hospitality. Like other institutions of the West, however, the cloisters suffered much at the hands of the barbarians.

There were many, even in this period, who objected to the monastic life. They asserted that Christians who fled to the desert or the cloister were lost to the world. Against them it was contended that the prayers of the godly monks were useful. Their lives certainly presented a sharp contrast to the prevailing corruption of society, and held before the minds of men an example of self-denying devotion to what was then believed to be the highest ideal. They exercised hospitality, they were kind to

Benedict of Nursia, 480-543.

Defences of monasticism.

the poor, and they befriended all who were in distress. The respect entertained for their sanctity made it possible for them boldly to rebuke the sins of the powerful, even where such words would have cost other men their lives. Monasticism was vindicated by the great Church teachers. They censured many of its abuses, but defended the conceptions which lay at the basis of the system, and especially lauded the virtue of celibacy. Jovinian was prominent among the few in this period who attacked these fundamental conceptions. Although himself a celibate and ascetic in life, he held that all such austerities were purely voluntary, and involved no peculiar merit. He maintained that the ordinary Christian life was holy. The world is divided up into but two classes, those who by faith have fellowship with Christ, and those who do not. He therefore denied that among real Christians any distinctions are to be made. These views were vehemently resisted by Jerome, and were condemned by Siricius, Bishop of Rome, and by Ambrose. Many hundred years were to elapse before the mind of the Church would be ready for such a reformation

Jovinian,
d. c. 406.

Division of
things sacred
and secular.

as Jovinian would have favored. The ideas which created the distinction between clergy and laity, also divided times, and places, and actions into secular and sacred. The belief of the early Church, that all of life was consecrated to God, gave way before a spirit akin to that of Old Testament legalism. Such men as Augustine and Chrysostom tried to keep this tendency within bounds, but without much effect, since even they were not free from similar impressions. Worship was resolved into forms and ceremonies which received the sanction of ecclesiastical authority. Instead of being recognized as the spontaneous expression of Christian feeling, it appeared to many to be a round of arbitrarily imposed observances. When the worldly-minded were rebuked for their lack of diligence in the worship of God, they alleged the cares of business and the inconvenience of attending the frequent services of the Church.

In the early part of this period the people not only had access to the Scriptures, but were urged to study them carefully. Some, however, could not read, and others were too poor to buy manuscripts. But since the Bible was read in course in the public services of the Church, anyone by constant attendance might become familiar with it. Those who were disposed to read or meditate, could retire to rooms in the galleries, devoted to their use, and provided with copies of the Scriptures.

As soon as Christianity became the religion of the rich and

Use of the
Bible.

powerful, and the desire to oppose to the splendor of pagan temples a severe simplicity, was less felt, the primitive aversion to art in worship began to pass away. Churches of

Churches. more imposing proportions and more costly furnishings began to be erected. The public buildings and pagan temples which were sometimes obtained through the munificence of the emperors, and were slightly remodelled for the uses of Christian worship, added much to the magnificence of Church architecture. Most of all these buildings were, as in the previous period, in the basilica form. They were consecrated with great solemnity, and thenceforth a peculiar sanctity was attached to them. More care was now given to the decoration of the interior. The cross, which was universally used in daily life, and at an earlier date had found its way into places of worship, was splendidly ornamented with

Pictures in worship. precious stones. Pictures, especially those representing Bible scenes and ideas, like Daniel in the lions' den, or Christ under the image of the Good Shepherd, came into general use, and, to some extent, in the minds of the half-converted heathen, took the place of the artistic decorations of their abandoned temples. Churches built in memory of martyrs were often adorned with paintings portraying their sufferings. This movement toward sensuous expression in Christian worship did not come so much from the clergy as from the mass of Christians and the Christian princes. The wealthy, on whose garments were frequently to be seen embroideries depicting some story from the Scriptures, were naturally ready to encourage the embellishment of churches with paintings and images. The evils to which this desire might lead, were pointed out by the more enlightened bishops, such as Eusebius of Caesarea. They especially resisted attempts to introduce representations of Christ, urging people rather to strive to be like him in their lives. But towards the end of the fourth century, the

Worship of images and saints.

use of images in the churches became general. People began to prostrate themselves before them, and many of the more ignorant to worship them. The defenders of this practice said that they were merely showing their reverence for the precious symbols of an absent Lord and his saints. Miraculous powers were ascribed to these images, and legends of marvelous cures and wonderful portents were related of them. As the heroic age of the Church passed away, the veneration for departed saints and martyrs became more extravagant. Churches were dedicated to their memories. The half-christianized heathen looked upon them somewhat in the same light as they formerly regarded

their heroes. Their intercessions were invoked, especially for the cure of diseases, and if, perchance, help seemed to come to anyone, he hung up in the church a gold or silver image of the part which had been healed. Saints were chosen guardians of churches, societies, cities, and districts. Their relics began to work miracles. The reverence with which ruder Christians regarded their memories gradually grew into worship. This new form of idolatry was condemned by the Church teachers, and yet its cause—the extravagant veneration of the saints—was commended by them, and vindicated against those who, like Vigilantius of Barcelona, and Ærius and his followers, attacked the whole practice.

The adoration of Mary became prevalent. The doctrine of her perpetual virginity was established in the Church. In the course of the Nestorian controversy she received the name Worship of Mary. “Mother of God,” and was elevated in the hearts of the devout above all the saints. The monks were especially zealous in promoting this worship of Mary. To her, and, in a less degree, to the saints, the common Christians looked for that mediatorial sympathy which they dared not seek from the Christ whose humanity seemed lost in his exaltation.

Palestine and the churches of the apostles had begun to acquire fame for peculiar sanctity on account of their relation to Pilgrimages. the founding of Christianity, and thus became the object of pious pilgrimages.

From earlier times it had been the custom of the Church to observe Sunday by special religious exercises and by an increasing abstinence from the pursuits of secular life. This custom was made a law by the Council of Laodicea (363). Sunday : Church festivals. Constantine legally recognized it, in 321, by forbidding the courts of justice to hold their sessions on that day, except for the humane purpose of manumitting slaves. He also commanded his soldiers to refrain from their customary military exercises. The public games, however, still continued to attract many from the proper observance of Sunday and of the Church festivals. But in 425 a law was passed forbidding all games on such days. The custom of observing Wednesday and Friday (*dies stationum*) as half-fasts was less usual, and soon ceased altogether in regard to Wednesday. Friday continued to be kept in memory of Christ’s passion. In many of the Oriental churches the Sabbath (Saturday) was still observed like Sunday, while in the West a large number, by way of opposition to Jewish institutions, held a fast on that day. The first feast of the year was Epiphany, the Epiphany.

manifestation, which in the East connected itself with Christ's baptism; while in the West, where it appeared later, it commemorated also the coming of the wise men and the first exhibition of miraculous power at Cana. Christmas originated in the West, and from there passed over into the Eastern Church. Many Christians still took part in the heathen festival of New Year's. To put an end to this practice a fast was proclaimed at that time, and was gradually developed into the festival of Christ's circumcision.

The great religious anniversary of the year was Easter, with its associated feasts. A period of fasting, which finally was forty days in duration, preceded it. This gave those who for months had been absorbed in the cares of business or the gaieties of society time for thoughtful and penitent preparation for the sacred duties of the great week. The festival began with Palm Sunday. At that time, to increase the thanksgivings of the people, the emperor was accustomed to publish special decrees of mercy. During the whole week, daily morning and evening services were held. Quietness and abstinence from labor were enjoined. On Thursday, the Lord's Supper was joyously celebrated, without the usual fasting, in commemoration of its original institution. Good-Friday was kept with great solemnity, not even the kiss of peace being allowed. Then came the great Sabbath, Saturday, the day before Easter. On that day many were baptized and clothed in white robes. In the evening, the people, with torches in their hands, filled the churches, where services were held until dawn. The Easter celebration was concluded, after the manner of the Jewish Passover, on the eighth day, White Sunday. Then the baptized laid aside their white robes and appeared with the rest of the Church. The festal season was prolonged from White Sunday to the day of Pentecost. The controversy in respect to the time for the celebration of Easter was settled by the Council of Nicea. But owing to a better knowledge of astronomy in the East, the Alexandrian reckoning, and therefore that of the whole Eastern Church, differed from that of Rome, until through the efforts of Dionysius Exiguus, to whom we owe our calendar, the same method was introduced at Rome also.

Those who were being prepared for entrance into the community of believers were divided into classes, according to their different stages of advancement in instruction, and of their participation in the public services of the Church. Baptism, which by the addition of supplementary rites had lost

its original simplicity, was administered in general only on Easter and Pentecost.

The Lord's Supper was the great act in which the worship of the Church centred. It was the privilege of the Church to be alone during its celebration. The earlier view in regard to its nature gave way to the belief that it was a sacrificial offering by the Christian priest. Intercessory prayers offered then were thought to be especially efficacious. Thus it was that prayers for the dead became commonly connected with it, and it began to be considered a sacrifice for them.

The ancient liturgies grew up about the service of the Lord's Supper. Liturgical worship was a gradual growth, each church, or its bishop, regulating its own worship or framing its own liturgy. By degrees, as uniformity was sought, the liturgy of the metropolitan church became authoritative. In the fourth and fifth centuries, and later, numerous liturgies arose, most of which bear the names of apostles, without any claim, however, to apostolic authorship. "Yet," to quote the words of Schaff, "they are based on a common liturgical tradition, which in its essential elements reaches back to an earlier time, perhaps in some points to the apostolic age, or even comes down from the Jewish worship through the channel of the Jewish Christian congregations." In this department, as elsewhere, there was a growth. We find in this period four groups of liturgies: the Oriental, the Alexandrian, the Roman, and the Gallican, all of which have certain resemblances to each other. In general the order of service was divided into two parts. In the first were the reading of Scriptures appropriate to the division of the year, the prayers for communicants and non-communicants, and the sermon. Then all those who were not members of the Church were dismissed. In the second part was the celebration of the Supper, with its introductory liturgy and ceremonies.

The prominence given to the sermon depended partly upon the amount of culture prevailing in each country, and partly upon the different ideas held as to the nature of the priestly office. In the West, where there was less culture, and a greater value was set upon the outward acts of the priest, the sermon did not excite much attention; although men like Augustine and Ambrose were effective preachers. In the East, on the other hand, fine oratory was prized. The sermon in the fourth century became more rhetorical. Its brilliant thoughts or witty expressions were sometimes received with loud applause. While there were some truly great preachers, like Basil, the two Gregories, and

Chrysostom, many were guilty of poor exegesis, want of definite plan, and empty rhetorical artifices.

The primitive Church music was choral and congregational. Hilary, and in the early part of the next period, Gregory the Great, were influential in improving Church music. The Arians and other heretics embodied their doctrines in verses to be sung. It was to counteract this influence that Chrysostom caused antiphonies and doxologies to be sung in processions. In the West, Ambrose, in his contest with the Arians, taught his congregation to sing antiphonal hymns. The most famous composers were Ephraëm Syrus, Hilary of Poitiers, and Ambrose. There was some opposition to the use of such hymns, on the ground that they were not taken from the Scriptures; and this could only be overcome by age and usage. Among the earliest extant Christian songs are: The "Gloria in Excelsis," a translation (thought to be by Hilary) of a much older Greek hymn; the "Trisagion" (Holy, Holy, Holy); and the "Te Deum," probably transferred into Latin by Ambrose from a Greek original.

There is no record of any peculiar robes being worn in public by the clergy. The ecclesiastical garments had no symbolical or sacerdotal significance. They were the apparel of the vestments of the clergy. Romans in the early centuries, kept by the clergy after the garments had ceased to be the fashion among the people. The first appearance of a distinction between priestly and secular dress is in a mosaic in the Church of St. Vitalis at Ravenna, belonging to the sixth century, and in another mosaic of the same period in the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople. From two pieces of the ancient Roman dress, the tunic and the toga, the costume of the Churches, East and West, was developed.

CHAPTER IV.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

IN this period there were controversies on the main points of Christian doctrine, which agitated the Church to its centre. Great ecclesiastical assemblies, called œcumenical councils, were held, for the purpose of settling these disputes and of defining orthodox opinion. The interference of the state in matters of doctrine is a fact that calls for particular notice. In philoso-

Great contro-
versies.

phy, Plato's influence was still predominant : Augustine, as well as Origen, was steeped in the Platonic spirit.

There were two principal schools in theology, two chief centres of theological influence. These were Antioch and Alexandria.

Schools of Alexandria and Antioch. Enthusiasm for biblical study left Alexandria for the Syrian capital ; but the Antioch scholars adopted a more sober and historical mode of interpretation than had belonged to the school of Origen, in which the allegorical method had prevailed. The interest in doctrinal theology was kept up in the Alexandrian school, which, in this particular, maintained its former repute.

It is interesting to observe the marked difference in the themes of theological discussion between the East and the West. It was

Character of discussions in the East and the West. the more speculative side of theology, questions pertaining to the Trinity and the person of Christ, that was uppermost in the East. In the West, on the contrary,

comparatively little was done in this particular province. Practical subjects—the doctrine of sin and of man's recovery by divine grace—absorbed the attention. Among the Latins there were no such heated disputes on abstruse points of metaphysical divinity as one might have heard in the fourth and fifth centuries, even from tradesmen and mechanics, in the Greek-speaking cities of the East. This difference was mainly owing to the native diversity of the Greek and the Roman character.

The fourth and fifth centuries were the golden age of patristic literature. Of the Alexandrian teachers, Didymus, although blind

Didymus, 308-395.

from childhood, was eminent for his learning. The most famous teacher of this school was Athanasius, who was made Bishop of Alexandria in 328, and was for half a

Athanasius, 298-373.

century the untiring and intrepid defender of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ against its Arian assailants. Five times he was driven into exile. Even Gibbon is moved to say of him that he “displayed a superiority of character and abilities which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy.” Both in writing and speaking, he was “clear, forcible, and persuasive.” The numerous treatises from his pen relate mostly to the incarnation and divinity of Jesus. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexan-

Cyril, d. 444.

dria, played a very conspicuous part in the controversies of the fifth century. He was an acrimonious polemic.

Among his various writings is an elaborate work against Nestorius.

There were prominent writers who, although they might differ

widely from Origen on various points, were imbued with his spirit. One of these was Eusebius of Cæsarea, in Palestine, who is best known as a historian, but was also a fruitful author in other branches of theology. Under this head may also be placed the three great Cappadocian bishops—the two Gregories and Basil—who, in connection with Athanasius, exercised a ruling influence in the Greek Church in subsequent generations. Basil was Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, which was his native place. In his youth he was a fellow-student at Athens with the Emperor Julian. He united an ardent attachment to a life of monastic retirement with extraordinary talents for public life. Hence while he took the lead in organizing monasticism in the East, he made a deep impression by his administrative activity as a bishop. His vast influence was more due to his personal weight than to his capacity as an author. Yet he had great authority as a theologian. Among his productions is a collection of letters which throw much light on the character of the times.

Eusebius of
Cæsarea, c.
265-340.

Basil, c. 330-
379.

Gregory of Nyssa was, perhaps, the most profound theologian of the three doctors of the Church whose names are so often connected. He was a younger brother of Basil. Gregory of Nazianzus—Gregory Nazianzen, as he is generally styled—was for a short time Bishop of Constantinople, but preferred to relinquish the office, rather than withstand the party in opposition to him. He was an orator of splendid ability, yet he was naturally shy and sensitive, and was subject, for this reason, to constant annoyance in the lofty station to which he was elevated, and which he was unwilling to retain, yet reluctant to lay down. He had been a fellow-student and room-mate of Basil at Athens, and was afterwards intimately associated with him. There was a partial estrangement near the close of Basil's life, but Gregory made him the subject of a glowing panegyric. Gregory was a man of ardent temperament, a poet of merit as well as a theological thinker.

Gregory of
Nyssa, b. c.
332, d. c. 394.

Gregory Nazi-
anzen, c. 330-
c. 390.

A contemporary of the illustrious Cappadocians, but a theologian of an utterly different spirit, was Epiphanius, Bishop of Constantia, the ancient Salamis, in Cyprus. He was a fanatical opponent of Origen's theology. His principal work, entitled "Drug-Chest," is a description and confutation of eighty heresies, the origin and peculiarities of which he took great pains to inquire into. Its historical value is much lessened by the spirit of bigotry which actuated him in his researches.

Among the Syrian fathers the most eminent in the fourth cen-

Epiphanius,
c. 310-403.

tury was Ephraëm, generally called Ephraëm Syrus. He partook of the prevalent monastic spirit, and lived as an anchorite near Edessa. So highly was he esteemed that in some of the churches of Greece his homilies were read immediately after the reading of the Scriptures. He was a prolific author. Among his compositions were hymns which showed him to be a poet of no inferior merit.

There were three distinguished teachers of the Antiochian school, of whom the most renowned was John Chrysostom, or John of "the Golden Mouth," so styled on account of his unrivalled eloquence in the pulpit. He was of noble parentage. From his mother, Anthusa, he received religious impressions strong enough to shape his career. A student of Libanius, the Sophist, he obtained for his rhetorical ability and proficiency the highest praise from that famous master. His strong religious bent took the ascetic form. He weakened his health by self-imposed austerities. A presbyter in his native city, he achieved an astonishing success as a preacher. In 398 he was made Bishop of Constantinople. From the pulpit of St. Sophia he preached to vast applauding congregations. At first his popularity was almost universal. But his simple mode of life and his righteous and strict administration of his office offended the laxer portion of the clergy. The plainness of his public rebukes of vice, and especially of the vices of the court, turned Eudoxia, the pleasure-loving empress, the wife of Arcadius, into a bitter enemy. The foes of the eloquent and evangelical bishop were reinforced by a jealous rival, Theophilus, Bishop of Alexandria, who was eager to advance his own episcopal authority. At length Chrysostom, despite the enthusiastic affection of his people, was banished. He was recalled, however, but was again doomed to exile, and was purposely subjected to hardship and indignities which terminated his life. As an expositor of Scripture, thoughtful and at the same time practical, bringing the truth of the Bible home to the heart and conscience, and in contact with the lives of men, Chrysostom has had few, if any, superiors. His works consist mostly of homilies and discourses.

A great light in the Antiochian school was Theodore of Mop-suestia, in Cilicia. His exegetical writings, in which he was governed by sound principles of grammatical and historical criticism, mark an epoch in the progress of biblical interpretation. Only second to him in rank as an exegete was Theodoret, who, like Theodore, was a native of Antioch, but was Bishop of Cyrus, a town in Syria.

Ephraëm Sy-
rus, d. c. 378.

Chrysostom,
347-407.

Theodore,
c. 350-428.

Theodoret,
c. 390-457.

One of the most conspicuous of the Latin writers of the fourth and fifth centuries was Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in Gaul. He was well educated by his parents, who were pagans of rank. He was an exceedingly active defender of the orthodox doctrine against Arianism. He was the first to discuss in Latin the recondite questions which afforded peculiar delight to the more subtle intellect of the Greek theologians. Hence he has been sometimes styled the Athanasius of the West. Of

Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, one of the most celebrated of the leaders of the Church in this period, we have already spoken. He was a Roman by birth, was trained for the bar, and became a magistrate at Milan; but an exigency arose which led the people to raise him by acclamation to the archbishop's throne. He ruled with extraordinary wisdom and

energy, carrying into the management of Church affairs the ripe sagacity of a statesman. His mind, if not highly original or specially fertile in thought, was characterized by good sense. His writings are partly doctrinal, and partly ascetic and moral. He was much influenced by the teaching of Basil. The great scholar at

this time among the Latins was Jerome, a considerable part of whose life was spent in the East. He was born at Stridon, on the borders of Dalmatia and Pannonia. He studied Greek and Roman literature at Rome. He sojourned for a time at Antioch, where he was led, by a voice of warning heard in a dream, to turn away from literary to ecclesiastical studies. After a residence in Rome he betook himself to Bethlehem, in the Holy Land, where he presided over a convent for the remainder of his life. There, in his cell, he pursued the studies and composed the works which placed him at the head of the scholars of the Church, and almost on a level with Origen, of whose theological opinions he was finally a virulent opponent. Among the various productions of Jerome the Latin version of the Bible, called the Vulgate, is the best known and the most useful. This he framed by revising the old Italic versions of the New Testament, and by translating the Old Testament from the Hebrew. He was a correspondent of Augustine, and was prominent in the controversies of the day. Unhappily, neither his scholarship and learning, nor his religious principles, availed to curb effectually the vehemence of temper which made him an adept in denunciation. In connection with the name

of Jerome may be mentioned one of his opponents in the disputes about Origen, Rufinus. He was an Italian by birth. He rendered a very important service in translating

Greek ecclesiastical authors into Latin. He wrote, also, after diligent researches, a work on the Apostles' Creed.

None of the writers who have been named, not even Ambrose or Jerome, Athanasius or Chrysostom, can be said to equal in distinction and in wide-spread and lasting influence, the foremost of Augustine. the Latin fathers, Augustine. His "Confessions" are

His "Confessions." an autobiography, in which the story of his sins and spiritual struggles is faithfully and frankly told. His

self-abasement, so deep and heartfelt, stands in striking contrast with the tone of a noted work bearing the same title, from the pen of a celebrated writer in the last century, the father of the sentimental school, Jean Jacques Rousseau. Augustine was born at Tagaste, a village of Numidia, on November 13, 354. His father, Patricius, a burgess of the town, was a pagan at that time, and so continued until near the end of life. He was a man vulgar

in tone and of violent temper. To the affectionate solicitude of his mother, Monica, a Christian woman, of a

tender, devout, and elevated spirit, the son was indebted for his rescue from a path of sin. He studied grammar and rhetoric in the schools of Tagaste and Carthage. He read the Latin authors with zest and appreciation, but he deplores his early neglect of Greek, a language in which he never became a proficient. His passions were fervent, and he gave way to sensual temptation. While still a youth he formed an illicit connection, and became the father of a child, whom he named Deodatus. He adopted the profession of a rhetorical teacher, first at Carthage. At the age of nineteen, higher thoughts and aspirations were stirred within him by a passage in the "Hortensius" of Cicero, on the worth and dignity of philosophy. It was the beginning of an inward conflict of long duration, during which he was followed by the unceasing prayers, and earnest, yet prudent, counsels of his mother. He left Carthage for Rome, but departed thence, after a time, and took up his abode in Milan. For a period he was enamored of the Manichean doctrine. The strife of good and evil in his own soul inclined him to a theory of dualism. Weaned from this delusion, he became deeply and profitably interested in New Platonism. In this state of mind he listened, at first mainly from curiosity, to the preaching of Ambrose. He was moved far more deeply than he had expected, was converted, and was baptized. He was at this time thirty-three years of age. His mother had joined him in Milan. At Ostia, as they were preparing to embark for home, she died. The account of her death forms one of the most pathetic passages in the "Con-

fessions." He gave up his property to the Church, and with a few friends, some of whom had followed him from Italy, he lived in seclusion in a house not far from Tagaste, spending the time in exercises of study and devotion. From this quiet retreat he was called to Hippo, where he became a priest, then a colleague of the bishop, Valerius, and finally, in 395, his successor. During the invasion of the Vandals, and while Hippo was besieged by them, on the 28th of August, 430, he died, in the seventy-sixth year of his age. As a teacher, preacher, and writer, and as an ecclesiastic whose influence extended far and wide, his career had been one of incessant and, in the main, of wholesome activity. Of the controversies in which he mingled, the contests with the Donatists and with the Pelagians are the most noteworthy. He was a very voluminous writer. He wrote on themes of philosophy and

His writings.

on topics of dogmatic theology, in treatises not included in his numerous controversial publications. His "City of God" is the principal apologetic work of that age. He composed exegetical homilies, sermons, and epistles, not to speak of other works not falling under either of these classes.

In the intellectual and spiritual development of Augustine, thought and experience were blended. He combined the genius of a dialectician and a mystic, and the characteristics of each in an extraordinary degree. His intellect is clear, acute, fond of speculation, yet on fire with emotion. In his own day, Augustine exerted a predominant influence on the grave doctrinal questions that were under debate in the Western Church. His continued sway is seen in the Church of the Middle Ages—in its theory of the sacraments and of the authority of tradition, and in the scholastic philosophy in which his dialectic turn reappears. Luther, an Augustinian monk, declared himself more indebted to Augustine than to any other writer. Calvin constantly quotes him, and eulogizes him as the best of the Fathers. His influence was powerfully felt in the Church of the West for upwards of a thousand years, and has continued until the present day.

Several other writers among the Latins in the fourth and fifth centuries were specially distinguished. John Cassianus is one to whom reference has already been made. He was born and educated in the East. He was a pupil of Chrysostom; but when Chrysostom was driven from his see, Cassianus emigrated to the West. He founded cloisters in Marseilles, and was active in introducing monastic life in Western Europe. He wrote on this subject, and he is also noted as the expounder and de-

Character of his mind.

Cassianus, d. c. 448.

fender of the form of doctrine known as Semi-Pelagianism. Vincent of Lerins derived his surname from the cloister on the island of Lerina, near the coast of Gallia Narbonica. In his work, entitled "Commonotories," he set forth the criteria of catholic doctrine as opposed to disputable opinions.

Vincent of
Lerins,
d. c. 450.

Salvian, a native of Gaul, was born near the beginning, and died near the end, of the fifth century. His principal work is a thoughtful and elegant treatise on divine Providence, in which he propounds views similar to those of Augustine

Salvian.

in the "City of God." Leo I., Bishop of Rome, who was so eminent as an ecclesiastical leader, was the author of numerous epistles and of a large collection of brief sermons. He was one of the earliest examples of pulpit eloquence among Roman ecclesiastics.

Leo I.,
Bp. 440-461.

In the sixth and seventh centuries, in the fast-advancing eclipse of culture and learning, the writers were few. Previously, in the East, the work of Eusebius as a Church historian had been carried forward by Theodoret, whose book covers the period from 325 to 429; by Socrates, who treats of the interval from 306 to 439; and by Sozomen, whose work extends over about the same period. Socrates is a writer whose critical ability is fully equal to that of Eusebius. Theodorus, a lector at Constantinople, narrates the events of Church history from 439 to 518; and Evagrius, of Antioch, from 431 to 594. Boetius, or Boethius, was a

Church
historians.

trusted counsellor of Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths. He was a man of scholarly tastes and profound learning. He was the victim of the machinations of powerful enemies whose iniquitous schemes he had thwarted, but who awakened in Theodoric's mind false suspicions of his fidelity. He was imprisoned in Pavia, and was put to death—an act for which the king is said to have suffered poignant remorse. Boetius translated writings of Aristotle and of other Greek authors. The most important of his works was the interesting book on the "Consolations of Philosophy." He was a Christian by profession, but there are no references to the Christian faith in this volume. Boetius by his translations, and through the book just referred to, became a connecting link between the ancient period and the mediæval era, in which he was held in high esteem.

Boetius,
c. 475-525.

Cassiodorus was a statesman high in station and influence under Theodoric and his successors, but, late in life, retired to a monastery which he had founded at Viviers, in Bruttium, his native province. His works relate to history and

Cassiodorus,
c. 468-c. 560.

theology. Gregory, Bishop of Tours, in Gaul, besides his work on "Miracles," composed an "Ecclesiastical History of the Franks," which is the most valuable historical monument for that period of French history. He is a credulous, but truthful, chronicler. Gregory I., or Gregory the Great, like Leo I., was chiefly eminent as an ecclesiastical ruler; but he wrote a copious theological treatise, called "Moralia," founded on the book of Job, besides homilies and very many letters of much historical value. Isidore, Archbishop of Seville, in Spain, was the most celebrated writer of his day. His works related to almost all branches of knowledge, and were considered to embody the learning of the time.

Gregory of
Tours.
Abp. 573-595

Gregory I.,
Bp. of Rome,
590-604.

Isidore, d. 636.

The three great doctrinal controversies in this period were the Arian, relating to the divinity of Christ and the Trinity; the Christological, which had to do with the two natures of Christ, or the inner constitution of his person; and the Pelagian, which had for its subject divine and human agency, sin, and the operations of grace in man's salvation.

Arius was a presbyter in Alexandria. He is described as tall in stature and of a serious, and even austere, character. His intellect was keen, but he was deficient in the intuitive faculty and lacked breadth of vision. He was educated at Antioch. He kindled the fires of debate by propounding the bald doctrine that Christ is a created being—the first of creatures, to be sure, and the being by whom all other creaturely beings are made. He was not created in time, since time began with creation; yet "once he was not." In 321, his bishop, Alexander, deposed Arius from his office, but he was befriended by powerful ecclesiastics. Constantine, having in vain attempted to appease the strife, called a general council to determine the question, which met at Nicea, a town in Bithynia, in 325.

The great
controversies.

The Arian
controversy.

This was the first of the œcumenical councils. There are seven to which the Greek and Roman churches ascribe this character.

The term *œcumenical* signifies *of the empire*. They were convoked, not by the Roman bishop, but by the emperors. Either in person, or by deputies, they were present to take part in the superintendence of the proceedings, although not professing to dictate the doctrinal conclusions. With the imperial commissioners there were associated in the presidency, patriarchs, or their representatives, who were not always or of necessity legates of the Roman see. On matters of doctrine, it was assumed that

œcumenical
councils.

the vote must be unanimous ; on questions of order and discipline, a majority vote was sufficient. Disciplinary ordinances might be revoked subsequently, for circumstances might alter. This was not the case with definitions of dogma. Unanimity was generally gained on these points, however, by excising the dissentient minority. The theory was that only bishops could vote, but priests and deacons took part in the deliberations. At Nicea, Athanasius was only a deacon ; yet few, if any, of the members were more influential.

Most of the authorities make the Nicene Council to have consisted of three hundred and eighteen members. Some of the Council of authorities reduce the number to about two hundred and fifty. Among them were venerable men who wore the scars that were printed on them by the tortures which they had suffered in the Diocletian persecution. As was true of the œcumenical councils generally, nearly all of them were Eastern bishops. One influential member, however, a trusted counsellor of Constantine, was a Spanish prelate, Hosius of Cordova. There

Parties in
the council.

were three parties in the council. The first was that of the Arians. The second was the orthodox party, which finally prevailed, whom we may call the Athanasians. The third, comprising at the outset a large majority, were fully satisfied with neither of the opposing formulas, but would have preferred less definite statements. It included numerous shades of belief. Should the council affirm the "Homœousian" view—*i.e.*, that the Son is of the same essence with the Father—or the "Homœousian," that he is of like essence? Constantine and Hosius threw their influence on the side of the first of these definitions, the one which the Anti-Arians demanded, and the council assented. The Son was declared to be coequal with the Father ; the creation of the Son was denied, and his eternal sonship or generation was affirmed ; and the characteristic Arian phrases or watch-words were anathematized. Arius and two of his friends were banished to Illyria. Two other bishops, Eusebius of Nicomedia and Theognis of Nicea, who declined to subscribe to the damnatory clauses, were deposed and banished, but they afterwards retracted their refusal and were restored to their sees.

The decision.

A peace thus made could not be permanent. Constantine himself soon fell under Arian influences, and turned against Athanasius. He was banished from his diocese, and obliged to reside for twenty-eight months at Treves. Arius would have been received back to the communion of the church at Constantinople, had not his sudden death on the day before the

A half-
century of
debate.

time appointed for the ceremony prevented. For half a century, controversy raged between the contending parties. In 335, the Semi-Arians, or Eusebians, as they were sometimes called, Eusebius of Nicomedia being one of their most prominent leaders, were

341. in the ascendent in the East. A second time Athanasius was driven into exile, and passed three years in the

West, under the protection of Constans and of Julius I., the Roman bishop. In 342 the Western Church declared for Athanasius. To avert a threatened division between the East and the West, the

341-345. Orientals, in a series of synods at Antioch, framed not less than five ambiguous symbols. At Sardica the Occidentals

343. met in a council and sustained Athanasius. At Philipopolis the Eastern bishops in a smaller number condemned him.

The death of Constans exposed Athanasius anew to the enmity of Constantius, who was now the ruler of the West as well as of the

353-355. East. By fraud and bribery, the Western councils of Arles and Milan were prevailed on to pronounce against

Athanasius. He now stood alone against the world, and for six years was sheltered by faithful monks in the lonely mon-

356-362. asteries of Thebais, situated on the tops of mountains or on the islands of the Nile. Finally the Nicene theology established

its ascendancy. Some of the Semi-Arian theologians pushed the Arian theology to extremes, from which the more conservative of the party recoiled; for the only

real bond of unity was a common opposition to certain Athanasian terms. Wise and moderate theologians, especially Basil and the two Gregories, recommended to favor the Nicene type of belief, of which they were earnest advocates. The churches of the West, with the exception of brief intervals when they were warped by sinister influences from their real bent, were on the same side. At

last, Theodosius the Great, an adherent of Nicea, summoned the second œcumenical council to meet at Constantinople in

Council of Constantinople. 381. There the Nicene Creed was reaffirmed, but the longer creed called "Constantinopolitan" had another

origin and a later sanction. Long afterwards, at a council at Toledo, in Spain, held in 589, *filioque* was inserted in this

The *filioque*. creed, by which it was made to affirm the procession of the Spirit from the Father *and the Son*, instead of "from the

Father," as the formula had stood before. This addition to the creed was not acceptable to the Eastern churches, and is one of

the standing points of disagreement between the Greeks and the Latins. The words "God of God" were in the Nicene Creed; they

were not contained in the "Constantinopolitan" creed, but were restored in the Latin form of this symbol. This creed was really the baptismal confession of the church at Jerusalem, enlarged. It was recognized as authoritative at the council of Chalcedon in 451. In it the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is set forth in Scriptural phrases, which could not evoke contention or dissent.

The Nicene Creed, as framed in 325 in Nicea, as modified in the "Constantinopolitan" form, and, among the Latins, in 589 at the Spanish Council of Toledo, reads in English as follows :

I believe in one God the Father Almighty ; Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all worlds [God of God], Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance [essence] with the Father : by whom all things were made ; who, for us men and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man ; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate ; he suffered and was buried ; and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures ; and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father ; and he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead ; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And [I believe] in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of Life ; who proceedeth from the Father [and the Son] ; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified ; who spake by the prophets. And [I believe] one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins ; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

In the Latin Church, which had always clung tenaciously to the unity of the divine essence, the remains of subordinationism, which belonged to the current conceptions on this mysterious

Development
of the doctrine
in the West.

subject, were eliminated from the doctrine. In the teaching of Augustine the mission of the Son is the act, not of the Father alone, but of the whole Trinity ; and the theophanies of the Old Testament are referred, not to the Son alone, but to the three persons in common. The *numerical* unity, or the identity of the persons, as to substance, which was not explicitly asserted at Nicea, and, although taught by Athanasius, was a view which many of the Nicene Fathers did not hold, became the established belief in the West. The ideas of the Latins found a terse expression in the paradoxical statements of the creed called

The "Athanasian Creed."

the Athanasian Symbol, which was composed by some author unknown, certainly not earlier than the closing part of the fifth century. It is not until near the age of Charlemagne that the first perfectly undoubted traces of its use

appear. In the West, as in the East, the Father continued to be distinguished from the Son, and each from the Spirit; but this distinction among the Latins was shut up within narrower limits.

The next great subject of investigation and conflict in the Church was the relation of the divine to the human nature in Jesus.

Christological controversy : Apollinarianism. Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, about the year 360, adopted the opinion which the Arians had entertained, that the Word or Logos in Christ took the place of the spirit, or the rational human soul, in man. This opinion was generally opposed and was pronounced a heresy. There gradually arose in

The Alexandrian view. the East two parties, the Alexandrian and the Antiochian. The Alexandrian view, of which Cyril was an eager and intolerant champion, made the two natures to be so unified by the preponderance of the divine, which takes up humanity into itself,

The Antiochian view. that Christ is the single, undivided object of adoration. The Antiochian view was that the two natures remain distinct in their attributes, and that the incarnation in its effects is gradual, so that room is left for the action in Jesus of a human will that freely overcomes temptation. The opposing tendencies of opinion came into conflict in consequence of the condemnation

Nestorius : Bp. 428-431. by Nestorius, Bishop of Constantinople, of the title "Mother of God," which the monks, zealous for the Marian cultus, applied to the Virgin. God, he said, could not have a human parent. Cyril, on the contrary, asserted that there is such a unification of the two natures that one personal subject is constituted, with one nature which is divine-human. Cyril's zeal was heightened by his jealousy of the rival patriarchate of Constantinople. Anathemas on the one side called forth counter-anathemas on the other. Cyril secured the adhesion of the Roman bishop. To settle

Council of Ephesus. the controversy, the Emperor, Theodosius II., called a General Council, at Ephesus, in 431. There Cyril organized an assembly of his followers without waiting for leading Oriental bishops to arrive, and condemned Nestorius. Later, the Orientals met in council and condemned Cyril. Theodosius, after an interval, took sides against the Nestorians. Cyril made very important doctrinal concessions to his theological

Persecution of Nestorius. allies. Nestorius was driven from one place of exile to another, and died about the year 440. The theological school at Edessa refused to acquiesce in the measures of the Anti-Nestorians, and it was broken up. Many who were oppressed by

The Nestorian sect. the dominant party fled into Persia, spread far into the East, and perpetuated their creed in the Nestorian sect.

The Egyptians who opposed the doctrine of two natures, and held that both were resolved into one by the incarnation, went by the name of Monophysites. But a reaction against them was provoked by Eutyches, an over-zealous Cyrillian, who carried the deification of Christ's humanity so far as to hesitate to admit that his body was of the same nature as ours. Condemned by his bishop, Flavianus of Constantinople, and by Leo I., Bishop of Rome, he was protected by Dioscuros of Alexandria, who presided over a council at Ephesus, which, from the violence of its spirit and proceedings, was styled the "Robber Synod." Shortly after, the imperial court, the influence of which had become extremely potent in matters of doctrine, turned against the monophysites. The Œcumenical Council of Chalcedon, in 451, followed the suggestions of a letter of Leo to Flavian, and framed a creed, parallel in importance, as regards this subject, with the Nicene formulary. The Chalcedon creed affirmed two natures in one person, united without confusion, change, division, or separation, the properties of each nature being preserved. It is a creed which even Nestorius would not have rejected. But the long debate was not concluded. The strife of tongues went on. The emperors intervened, now on one side and now on the other. The attitude of Justin I. moved the Monophysites to break off their connection with the orthodox adherents of Chalcedon, and in the course of the sixth century to form sects in Egypt, Syria, and Armenia, which still exist under the names of the Coptic, Ethiopic, Jacobite, and Armenian Churches. Justinian (527-565) sought to win back the Monophysites by concessions which created more discontent than they quelled. An edict called the "Three Chapters," designed to please the Egyptian party, roused a violent dispute, and was very obnoxious in the West. The fifth Œcumenical Council failed to conciliate the opponents of the Chalcedon creed. The last phase in the long contention was the Monothelite controversy, on the question whether there are, or are not, two wills in the incarnate Christ. It was fomented by an imprudent attempt to pacify the conflicting parties by means of a new formula. In 680, the Emperor, Constantinus Pogonatus, summoned the sixth Œcumenical Council to settle the point. As the will, in the current philosophy, was counted as one of the properties of the nature, it was determined that the Duothelites, or adherents of the doctrine of two wills, were right. The opposite opinion had been maintained by Pope Hono-

The Monophysite conflict.

"Robber Synod," 449.

Council of Chalcedon.

Justin I., 518-527.

Monophysite sects.

Fifth Œcumenical Council, 553.

Sixth Œcumenical Council.

rius I. Hence he was, by name, anathematized by the council as a heretic, and this declaration was approved by more than one of his successors, notably by Leo II. After this conciliar verdict, the monothelite opinion continued to be cherished by the Maronites, a party of separatists from the Catholic Church. They still exist as a distinct community in and near the Lebanon. Their name is connected with an ancient monastery of St. Maron on the Orontes, and is, besides, obscurely traced to one or more personages bearing this name and title. In 1182, they were brought into connection with the Church of Rome, but this union was not formally completed until the Council of Florence, in 1445. Special privileges are still conceded to them by the Roman see.

Only one other Œcumenical Council after the sixth is owned alike by the Greeks and Latins. It is the second Nicene Council (787), where the iconoclasts were condemned. These ancient assemblies were often tumultuous, and their proceedings were frequently marked by an absence of fairness as well as of dignity. Even the first Nicene Council, as we have seen, the noblest of these bodies, was governed by the imperial will. Gregory of Nazianzus, the renowned theologian, who presided for a while over the first Council of Constantinople, in 381, said that he had never known a synod which did not aggravate the evils which it undertook to remedy. Cardinal Newman, an admirer of the Œcumenical Councils, says that "they have nothing to boast of in regard to the fathers, taken individually, which compose them. They appear as the antagonist host in a battle, not as the shepherds of their people." And he has drawn a graphic picture of the scenes of violence at Ephesus in 431, where Cyril and other leaders, inflamed with bitter hostility, appeared each with an armed escort. Even at Chalcedon, the outcries of the bishops, and other unseemly displays of passion, were such as would hopelessly disgrace any modern church assembly.

If the East was kept in a ferment by the intricate problems pertaining to the Trinity and the Saviour's person, it was among the Latins that the doctrine of sin, and the question of the extent of man's dependence on grace, were of absorbing interest. Pelagius was a British monk, who came to Rome in the last decade of the fourth century. Where he was educated we do not know, but wherever he was taught, Greek was among the studies that he had pursued. He was a man of large frame, sober and strict in his morals, and with an understanding clear, if not

Pope Honorius I.

The Maronites.

Character of the Councils.

The Pelagian controversy.

deep. He was offended by the laxness of conduct which he observed at Rome, even among the clergy, and was inclined to attribute it to the effect of the doctrine of man's helplessness, which nothing in the course of his own religious experience inclined him to adopt. For he had not, like Augustine, wrestled in agony with temptation and been vanquished in the conflict. With a younger man, Cœlestius, a lawyer, who embraced a religious life, and joined him, he crossed over to Africa. There it was that the resistance to the doctrines of Pelagius began in earnest; and in this warfare, which spread far and wide, Augustine was his most effective adversary. Augustine and Pelagius were the representatives of two opposite systems. They differed in their idea of the relation of God to the creation, and especially to man.

Augustinism
and Pelagian-
ism.

The one conceived of the divine energy as perpetually needed and forever exerted. The other regarded the world and man as furnished, at the start, with inherent powers sufficient for self-movement and self-guidance. With Pelagius, freedom is power of election, in which the power of contrary choice is always present. With Augustine, true freedom is the union of the will with the divine law, the result of which is voluntary, yet spontaneous obedience, where freedom and necessity coalesce. Both agreed that the first sin was Adam's free act, when there was still a power to the opposite. But that sin, according to Augustine, brought upon Adam, and equally on the race that was to spring from him, physical death, guilt, and a bondage of the will, or an inherited dominion of sin in the soul. Humanity, before it was individualized, was really in Adam, and in him acted and was corrupted.

Augustine's
realism.

We are responsible at birth for that act, and share all its consequences. Pelagius, on the contrary, held that we sin only by imitation of our first parent, that there is no such helpless slavery of the will as Augustine asserted, and that physical death is a natural necessity, apart from the effect of the primal transgression. Char-

Nature of
character.

acter, instead of being, as Augustine said, a single, dominating principle, either morally good or morally evil, is rather a series of acts, or a congeries of traits, some of them right and some of them wrong. Holding to the absolute impotence of

Grace in con-
version.

the will since the fall, as regards goodness and holiness, Augustine ascribed conversion wholly to the efficiency of divine grace, which touches the springs of choice, is irresistible, and is bestowed on those whom God has purposed to recover to himself. But the gift of perseverance he does not impart to all of the regenerated. It is only the elect who receive it. All these propo-

sitions Pelagius denied. With him grace was mainly the outward teaching of the law, of the gospel, and of divine providence. It is optional with the sinner whether or not he will yield to the call of the gospel, and whether, in case he does yield, he will persevere in the chosen path. Predestination, as Augustine held it, according to whom the number of the saved was pre-determined, and their salvation secured by omnipotent power, the decision not being left with man, was regarded by Pelagius as destructive of human responsibility. Augustine, at an earlier day, but after his conversion, had taught conditional predestination, resistible grace, and a reserved power in the will. Reflection led him to a change of opinion. His earlier views, he came to think, underrated the strength of sin, and logically divided the glory of man's emancipation from evil between himself and God.

In this change he advanced beyond the type of opinion which Ambrose and other teachers in the Western Church had previously adopted. They had denied that the believer merits reward for his faith, and had emphasized the agency of the Holy Spirit, but had not made the Spirit the sole efficient in the work of regeneration.

Cœlestius was excommunicated for heresy by the synod of Carthage in 412. Pelagius had not remained long in Africa, but had betaken himself to Palestine. In 415, he appeared before two synods, the last of which was held at Diospolis, and at both synods was acquitted. Augustine charged that at these assemblies he had not frankly brought out his opinions. The Roman bishop, Innocent I., favored the North African opponents of Pelagius. His successor, Zosimus, at first wavered, but at length took the same position, and adopted the Anti-Pelagian canons of a council of Carthage, held in 418. Imperial edicts were issued in favor of them. Bishops, among them an able man, Julian of Eclanum, who refused to subscribe to the verdict of Zosimus, were banished. In the East, the cause of Pelagius became mixed with the Nestorian contest in such a way that his tenets, also, were proscribed by the council of Ephesus, in 431. But the prevailing theology in the East was really not Augustinian. Neither

was it Pelagian. Theodore of Mopsuestia, and his school, taught that redemption was not exclusively negative; it raised man to a higher than his original state prior to the fall. Chrysostom teaches that the free action of the will is the condition and concomitant of all the operations of grace. The position of the Greeks was intermediate between that of the Pelagians and Augustinians.

Such an intermediate type of belief was brought forward in the West by Cassianus, in the form of "Semi-Pelagianism." The innate proclivity of man to sin, and the need of the grace of the Spirit, were strongly asserted; but inborn guilt was denied, and conversion was made to result from the joint influence of the two factors, the agency of God and the free action of the will. A distinguished Semi-Pelagian, in the middle of the fifth century, was Faustus, Bishop of Rhegium. At length, two councils, the Synod of Orange, and the Synod of Valence, both held in 529, condemned the Semi-Pelagian doctrine of the coöperation of grace and free-will, condemned, also, the doctrine of predestination to sin, which not Augustine, but some extreme Augustinians, had broached, and were silent on the general point of absolute predestination and irresistible grace. In 530, the decision of these synods was approved by the Roman Bishop, Boniface II.

We have now to glance at the topics of Christian doctrine that are not directly included in the great controversies which have just been reviewed. The form of the defences of Christianity was determined by the character of the attacks and objections, which were in part new, and in part the same as in the former period. The Emperor Julian found an opponent in Cyril of Alexandria. Among the reproaches brought by Julian against the Christians were the spirit of persecution which had sprung up among them, and the homage paid to the relics and the graves of martyrs; practices, however, which he admitted and even charged were discountenanced by the teaching of their Master. The principal apologetic treatise in this era was the noble work of Augustine, the "City of God," the first attempt in Christian times at something like a philosophy of history. In 410, a thrill of dismay went through the empire at the news of the capture and sack of Rome by Alaric the Goth. The foundations of the world seemed to be shaken by the fall of the eternal city. Complaints broke out with renewed vehemence against the religion whose God had failed to shield Rome from the appalling disaster, and against its disciples who had forsaken the divinities of the ancient system. To meet this assault, Augustine composed his work, which embraces, also, a positive explanation and vindication of the Christian faith. He refers to terrible calamities that occurred in the days of the Republic, and of the earlier Cæsars. He insists that disasters may have a disciplinary

Apologies.

Julian's
attack.

Augustine's
"City of
God."

value greater than their cost. He undertakes to show that there are, and have been from the beginning, two great communities or cities, the city of God, comprising within it all his true worshippers, and the city of the world, whose denizens may prosper in this life but have no part in the future and everlasting blessedness of the right-

eous. A Spanish presbyter, Orosius, a contemporary of Augustine, wrote a briefer work in the same general strain.

Among the proofs adduced by Eusebius of Cæsarea, and other defenders of the gospel, were the character of Jesus and the apostles, which excludes the idea of deception on their part; the evidence of miracles and prophecies, and the spread of Christianity in the face of almost invincible obstacles. Worthy of notice is Augustine's idea of a miracle as an event which excites an unwonted degree of astonishment; although natural events, since they, too, spring just as directly from the will of God, would occasion the same feeling, if they were not familiar.

Scholars like Jerome and Rufinus knew how to discriminate between the apocryphal and the canonical books of the Old Testament, but their knowledge of this distinction did not diffuse itself. Augustine quotes the two classes of books indiscriminately. Both are included in the list of books sanctioned

as canonical by the Council of Carthage in 397. The same council includes in the canon all the Antilegomena, or books that had been doubted by some. These were

all recognized by Jerome and Augustine. The day of critical inquiry and discussion was passing by, and the drift was towards uniformity on all points of this nature. The Church of Rome now received the Epistle to the Hebrews, which it had rejected; and in the East, after the sixth century, the Apocalypse, which had not been received by leading theologians, as Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret, takes its place in the canon. The

doctrine of verbal inspiration was widely prevalent, and was even held by many to extend to the Septuagint version. Mystical and allegorical modes of interpretation

were much in vogue. In the Antiochian school, in such writers as Theodore and Chrysostom, the view taken of inspiration allows much more to the human factor in the composition of the Scriptures, and among them there is a sounder method of exegesis.

Tradition as a source of knowledge as to apostolic teaching was highly valued; but, generally speaking, everything thus transmitted was thought to be contained, in some form, either clear or obscure, in the Scriptures. Vincent of Lerins laid

Orosius.

Proofs of
Christianity.

The canon.

Council of
Carthage,
397.

Inspiration
and interpre-
tation.

Tradition.

down as the note of catholic or orthodox doctrine, that it is always everywhere, and by all believed—*quod semper, ubique et ab omnibus creditum est*. In the Latin Church this rule has been regarded as sound, although it was used by the author as a bulwark for the Semi-Pelagian opinion.

Notes of
catholic doc-
trine.

The authority of general councils was recognized as supreme, they being under the special guidance of the Holy Ghost. They do not add to the sum of Christian doctrine, but define what has been revealed by Christ and the apostles. Augustine holds that the decisions of a council may be improved by a later council; but whether such improvement may include correction is not stated. His theory is that a general council simply gives definite form to a conviction to which the Church, through a process of investigation and reflection, under the guidance of the Spirit, has been previously led. Behind the council is the universal Christian consciousness at a particular stage of its progress.

Authority
of councils.

Augustine laid down the maxim that "faith precedes knowledge;" that is, a living experience of the gospel is requisite for insight into its meaning. It is meant that we should understand the truth, but the practical appropriation of it is first in order. The era of critical scholarship was vanishing, and reverence for Church authority was growing. Augustine says that he should not believe the gospel, if he were not moved thereto by the authority of the Church. He looks on the Church as a sufficient voucher for the canon and the authorized interpreter of its contents. In this period, manuscripts of the Bible were multiplied, and the laity were exhorted to read it. Yet as we approach the close of the period, the custom of reading it is seen to be passing away, partly from the incoming of barbarism, and partly because the prevalence of allegorical interpretation created the feeling that a layman could not understand it.

Faith and
reason.

Authority of
the Church.

Along with the ordinary proofs of the existence of God from the necessity for a first cause, and from the evidences of design, Augustine seeks to frame a demonstrative argument, based on the philosophical doctrine of realism, and Boetius makes a like attempt on the same foundation, which was derived from Plato. Our knowledge of God, according to Augustine, is relative; that is, we know him not as he is in himself, but only in the revelation of himself, which is shaped to correspond to the limited measure of our understanding. In him the attributes are

Proofs of the
being of God.

Angels and
demons.

neither distinguished from one another, nor from the substance of his being. Angels and demons are the instru-

ments of his will, for dispensing mercies and executing judgments. Angels were divided into three general and nine special classes. The first clear sanction of the invocation of angels, as intercessors, is in Ambrose. In the sixth century, churches were dedicated by Justinian, and, also, in Gaul, to the Archangel Michael. As the homage of angels spread, the scriptural prohibitions of the worship of the creature were avoided or evaded by distinctions in the kind and degree of worship which is offered to different orders of supernal beings. It was not to be expected that common people would clearly comprehend, or faithfully observe, these theological distinctions.

On the subject of redemption, it was still the doctrine that Christ, in some way, has rescued us from the hands of Satan. The posterity of Adam, it was said by Augustine, by the laws of war, share in the lot of their parent Adam, who gave himself up a captive to Satan. They must be liberated, not by dint of power, but by righteous means. Satan exceeded his power in slaying Jesus, and lost all right over believers in him. By others, it was said that Christ discharged a debt due to God from the sinner. God's truth and his love were both maintained through the work of Christ. Cyril of Alexandria says that he bore the curse of sin which rested on us. Much was made of the physical union of Christ with humanity, whereby, as it was believed, immortal life, including the glorified body received at the resurrection, are imparted to his followers. He leavens, as it were, with a life-giving influence the race into which he enters. Faith was almost universally made a synonym of orthodoxy, so that good works must be conjoined with faith as the condition of salvation. Baptism is necessary, and for sins after baptism penance is requisite. Mortal were distinguished from venial sins: the former involve the forfeiture of grace, and, unless repented of, bring perdition. In the fourth century the custom began of invoking deceased martyrs and asking for their prayers. With this habit, it has already been explained, the reverence for their relics and images was enhanced.

In confuting the Donatists, who claimed that the note of the true Church was the holiness of its members, Augustine set forth catholicity as the real and principal criterion. By this he meant that the Church is the visible society, spread over the earth, and having within it the apostolic sees. This Church, he claimed, is to be called holy, even if it contain within it unworthy members, who, although in it, are not of it. The tares

The atone-
ment.

Faith and
works.

Mortal and
venial sins.

The note of
catholicity.

must be left to grow with the wheat. The Church held, moreover, against the Donatists, that the efficacy of the sacraments is independent of the character of the officiating minister. Baptism by one who is pronounced a heretic will save a man only in case he afterwards enters into communion with the catholic body. The central point of Church authority—the *culmen auctoritatis*—Augustine places in the see of Peter at Rome. Yet in one place he makes Christ himself to be the “rock,” in the declaration of the Lord to Peter, although elsewhere he interprets the rock as denoting Peter.

The see of Rome.

The sacraments. The sacraments, the visible signs and vehicles of an invisible grace which accompanies them, were especially baptism and the Lord’s Supper, although the term “sacrament” was frequently applied to marriage, the ordination of priests, and even to Old Testament usages, including the Sabbath and sacrifices. Through the influence of Augustine, the doctrine came to prevail in the West that unbaptized infants are lost. Their punishment, he taught, is not merely negative, or the deprivation of good, but is yet of the mildest sort. Infants.

The Lord’s Supper.

Transubstantiation was not taught. The prevailing tenet respecting the Lord’s Supper was that the glorified Christ unites himself with the bread and the wine, as the Logos once entered into humanity. They become in us the seed of a glorified body, the source of immortal life. The Lord’s Supper was an offering to God, so held at first in a figurative sense, and afterwards literally. Prayers at the Lord’s Supper were considered to be remarkably efficacious.

The intermediate state. The transference of the pious dead in Hades to paradise, by Jesus, in the interval between his death and resurrection, was still an accepted belief. The phrase, “He descended into Hades,” was not generally found in the Apostles’ Creed until the beginning of the fifth century. The introduction of the doctrine of purgatory was due to the influence of Augustine, who suggested that imperfect Christians may be purified in the intermediate state, by purgatorial fire, from their remaining sin. His conjecture was converted into a fixed belief. Thus the intermediate state was transmuted into a purgatory. All perfected saints, it was now believed, and not alone martyrs with others of exceptional sanctity, as had been formerly assumed, go at once to heaven.

Doctrine of purgatory.

Supplication for departed Christians had been common since the second century. With the spreading belief in purgatory there

was a new motive for offering these prayers, since they might procure an abridgment of this species of torment. The belief in apparitions of the dead, opposed by Chrysostom, favored by Augustine, established itself in the Church. The millenarian theory was discarded by the educated class. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was taught in the more refined Alexandrian form by the principal Greek theologians, but was advocated by Augustine with a grotesque and startling literalism. In the fourth century, restorationism, or the ultimate salvation of all, was the opinion of theologians as eminent as Gregory of Nyssa and Theodore of Mopsuestia, and was accepted less definitely by Gregory Nazianzen. These held, with Origen, that the design of punishment is to reform. The crusade against Origen's teaching included restorationism among its objects of attack. From the beginning of the fifth century, this doctrine, which was withstood by Augustine, was discarded.

Prayers for
the dead.

The doctrine
of the resur-
rection.

PERIOD IV.

FROM GREGORY I. TO CHARLEMAGNE (590-800).

THE FOUNDING OF THE CHURCH AMONG THE GERMANIC NATIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY: THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF MOHAMMEDANISM.

CHRISTIANITY had become the religion of the old nations of the empire and of those Teutonic peoples who came down from the north and settled in Italy, Gaul, and Spain. The gospel was now to extend its influence into regions where the Roman arms had never penetrated, or whence they had receded at the first alarm from the barbarian invaders. Anglo-Saxon England, Germany, and the new nations along the Danube were to be reached by the Christian faith. In this period, also, it was to receive a terrific blow in the rise of Mohammedanism, and the victorious march of Islam over Syria, Palestine, Africa, and Spain.

Progress of
Christianity.

The Christianity which was to accomplish this work of conversion, and to come into conflict with these opposing forces, had, unhappily, parted with its ancient purity and simplicity. The kingdom of God had become identified with the visible Church, through whose mediation, it was thought, salvation was alone possible, and obedience to whose laws was often the sum of the requirements laid on converts. The religious training of the mediæval peoples was analogous to that of the Jews under the completed hierarchical system. But the inner, living principle of the gospel was still in being, and was powerful enough to survive, despite obscurations, and to preserve the elements of a purifying reaction. The development of Christianity

Degenerate
character of
Christianity.

Traits and re-
ligion of the
German na-
tions.

was influenced in an important manner by the character of the German nations, and especially of those who dwelt somewhat beyond the reach of Roman traditions. In their sense of personal independence, in their courage, faith-

fulness and purity, the Germans excelled other barbarian tribes. The Teutonic religion reflects the strength and warlike propensities of the peoples to whom it belonged. The voluptuous and effeminate side of the classic mythology is absent. The religion of the Germans is closely allied to that of the Scandinavians, with which we are made acquainted in the Eddas. The more prominent divinities are recalled in the names of the four days of the week: Tuesday (named from Thiu, god of war); Wednesday (from Woden, the chief divinity, the god of the air and sky, the giver of fruits, and delighting in battle); Thursday (from Thor, the Scandinavian equivalent of Donar, the god of thunder and the weather, armed with a hammer and thunderbolt); Friday (from Freyr, Scandinavian for Fro, god of love). The name Easter also comes from Ostara, goddess of the morning light, or of the return of the sun in spring. The popular belief in dwarfs, fairies, and elves, which lingered for ages, recalls to remembrance the lesser Teutonic divinities. The Germans were the Protestants of heathen nations. Deep woods were often their only temples. It was the myterious, and not the sensuous, that called out reverence. They consecrated venerable trees to their gods. Unlike the Celts they had no powerful priesthood. Every head of a family might perform the rites of worship in his own household without the intervention of the priest of the community. Women were held to be peculiarly wise and skilful in learning the will of the gods. This feeling also manifested itself in a belief in witches, a belief which unhappily long survived the decay of the Teutonic religion. As was the custom with other savage tribes, human victims were sometimes slain in the sacrifices. Brave warriors expected at death to be received in Walhalla, where they were to sit at banquet with the gods.

Christianity had to overcome many obstacles in the conversion of the Germans. It not only aimed to supplant the gods whom they had been taught by their fathers to honor, and to whom they traced the lineage of their kings, but it seemed to threaten their national independence. It was brought to them by ecclesiastics who were subjects of a foreign power; its services were held for the most part in Latin; and its converts were generally required to look to the Bishop of Rome as their lord in spiritual things. They were told by the missionaries—men of ascetic manners and frequently of narrow views—that their own gods were demons, and that to worship them was a damnable sin, for which their ancestors were suffering eternal tor-

Obstacles to
the conversion
of the Ger-
mans.

ments. Later in this period, among the Frisians and Saxons on the continent, and even in some parts of England, Christianity was looked upon as the badge of slavery to a foreign despot, and all the patriotism of the people was awakened in the defence alike of their homes and of their gods.

And yet, notwithstanding these hindrances, the Germans were rapidly converted to the principles of Christianity. It has been suggested that perhaps the old religion was insensibly losing its hold upon their minds. Political influences and the intermarriage of princes had also much to do with the introduction and progress of the gospel among the various tribes. The minds of the rude multitudes were attracted by the sight of wonder-working relics. Marvels occurred in their presence, which their fancies or their fears, wrought upon by the stories of the missionaries, readily accepted as miraculous attestations of the truth of the new religion. That holy men could work miracles was never for a moment doubted. Even missionaries like Boniface and Ansgar, although disclaiming such supernatural gifts for themselves, believed that others possessed them.

The Anglo-Saxons were the first who now became objects of the missionary efforts of the Church. They did not receive Christianity from the Britons, because in the bitter struggle which attended their conquest of Britain the Celtic inhabitants were driven, step by step, back to the western part of the island, and with them went their civilization and religion. In Ireland, however, "the island of the saints," were preparing influences that would help in bringing a part of England again under the influences of the gospel. From Ireland Columba went out in the last half of the sixth century, and converted the Northern Picts. Upon the island of Hy, given by them, he founded the monastery of Iona, which had the highest reputation for the learning and piety of its inmates.

But Christianity was to come to the Anglo-Saxons first from Rome. Gregory, an abbot of a Roman convent, was attracted by the faces of some young captives in the slave-market. Tradition said that when informed that they were Angles, he exclaimed: "Not Angles, but angels." He forthwith became interested for the conversion of their countrymen, and although he was prevented from going to them himself as a missionary, he did not forget them when he was called to fill the chair of St. Peter. Ethelbert, King of Kent, who had married Bertha, a Frankish princess, allowed her to observe freely the rites of her reli-

Aids in the
conversion of
the Germans.

Conversion of
the Anglo-
Saxons.

Conversion of
Ethelbert.

gion. At this opportune moment, Gregory sent the abbot Augustine, with a numerous train of followers, as missionaries to the English. After some delays they landed on the island of Thanet, east of Kent. It was nearly two hundred years since the legions of the empire had been withdrawn, and now this band of monks came to reunite the country to Rome, not, however, to the seat of imperial but of spiritual authority. The king hastened to meet Augustine, but, fearful of magic, received him and his companions in the open air. The simple and unselfish life of the monks won the confidence and respect of all. The minds of the people were impressed by the mysterious ritual and by the miracles which they believed that the missionaries performed. Ethelbert gave Augustine a residence in Canterbury. He soon yielded to the influence of his wife and of the preachers. His conversion led multitudes to embrace Christianity. Augustine, who now received episcopal consecration, carried out the moderate policy which Gregory had outlined. Temples were changed into churches, and furnished with relics. For heathen festivals, there were substituted Christian festivals on sacred days of the Church. At the time of the conversion of Kent, Ethelbert exercised a sort of jurisdiction over Essex. He therefore used his influence to introduce Christianity there. About the year 601, Augustine was made archbishop, with power not only over the English churches, but over the British likewise. He still resided in Canterbury. This place and not London, as Gregory at first intended, became, on account of the political divisions of the country, the metropolitan town. Augustine required of the British conformity to the Roman ritual and submission to himself as primate. Being unable to accomplish his purpose, he is said to have threatened them with the vengeance of the Anglo-Saxons. After the death of Ethelbert, Christianity met with serious reverses in his dominions. But it was soon to find a potent ally in the north. Edwin, King of Northumbria, became the most powerful ruler in England. He married a daughter of Ethelbert, who brought with her a bishop, Paulinus. The king, although he abandoned Paganism, did not immediately accept Christianity. He was finally moved to call together his wise men to decide between the two religions. At this council one of them thus addressed him: "The present life of man on earth, O king, seems to me, in comparison with that time which is unknown to us, like the swift flight of a sparrow through the room where you sit at supper in winter. The sparrow flies in at one door and immediately out at another, and, whilst he is within, is

Augustine
made Arch-
bishop of
Canterbury.

safe from the wintry storm ; but he soon passes out of your sight into the darkness from which he had emerged. So this life of man appears for a short space, but of what went before, or what is to follow, we are utterly ignorant. If, therefore, this new doctrine contains something more certain, it seems justly to deserve to be followed." The high-priest of paganism was the first to declare for Christianity. Northumbria had, however, become Christian, but, a

Northumbria
and Mercia.

few years before, it lost its power through the rise of the heathen kingdom of Mercia. Paulinus fled to the south. Soon another champion was raised up in King Oswald, and under him the Irish missionaries from Columba's monastery at Iona carried on the work left by Paulinus. Aidan was made bishop, and given a residence at Lindesfarne. But Christianity was not safe from the attacks of Mercia until Oswin, Oswald's successor, defeated the Mercians in 655. In the meantime devoted men had carried the gospel to the other nations of the island.

Strife between
British and
Saxon Chris-
tianity.

As soon as political affairs in the north were in a more settled condition, strife arose between the British and the Romish churchmen. Colman, who now presided over the Northumbrian see which Aidan had held, was, like his predecessor, of the Scottish persuasion. The differences in ecclesiastical customs between the British, or Scottish party, and the Romanists had become a source of trouble, even dividing the royal family upon the question respecting the day on which to observe Easter. Not to dwell on a peculiar style of tonsure in vogue among the British, and the non-observance of a rule of celibacy by their clergy, the Easter question was the most important point of conflict. The British adhered to the old method of reckoning which had been in use at Rome until the reform introduced by Dionysius Exiguus. Furthermore, they did not hesitate to hold Easter on the 14th of Nisan, the Jewish lunar month, if that came on Sunday, while in such a case the Romans postponed the festival one week. The British were not Quarto-decimans in the sense which this term had in the second century, and therefore from their customs nothing can be inferred in favor of a direct Asiatic origin for their Church. To adjust the differences, a con-

Conference at
Whitby.

ference was held at Whitby in 664, in the presence of King Oswin, between Colman and his Scottish friends on the one side, and the Saxons, led by the presbyter Wilfred, afterwards Archbishop of York, on the other. The king decided for Rome, influenced probably by a reverence for the divine authority claimed for it, although he expressed his feeling as a fear

that St. Peter, who had the keys, would otherwise exclude him from heaven. Colman and his followers forthwith left the see of St. Aidan and went back to Iona. The decision had an important effect on the subsequent history of the English Church. The more free spirit of the British, which would have proved powerful in resisting the encroachments of Rome, was driven out. Yet the Church was perhaps saved from perilous irregularities, and brought into close connection with the development of the civilization and Christianity of Europe.

The Irish cloisters, still famous for learning, continued to attract many English youth, until Theodore of Tarsus, a man of
Schools in England. scholarly abilities, was sent to England as Archbishop
Theodore, 668-690. of Canterbury, to confirm the Roman hierarchy and to introduce schools. Wilfred, Archbishop of York, was also instrumental, despite the troubles brought upon him by the jealousy of Theodore, in promoting the same ends. The schools planted by Theodore were celebrated for their successful devotion to learning. In them the Greek language was cultivated. The most noted scholar of the age was a monk, who spent his days in the monastery at Yarrow. It was the Venerable Bede, to whom we owe much of what we know of the history of the English Church. The beginnings of Anglo-Saxon literature were made. Bible stories, turned into a simple and vigorous verse by Cædmon, were circulated everywhere among the common people.

The cloisters which sprung up in different parts of the country bound men together by the monastic tie, and gave rise to a consciousness of unity which was helpful in its influence on
State of the Saxon Church. the political growth of England. The national idea also found an embodiment in the allegiance of all churches to the one see of Canterbury. The close dependence of the Anglo-Saxon Church upon Rome was gradually weakened as it ceased to be a missionary church, and as the English kings, like their German contemporaries, began to grasp authority in Church affairs. The Papal see, however, still enjoyed more power and respect in England than among the other German nations. The constant efforts made to reunite the old British Church to Rome were without permanent results until the conquest of Ireland and Wales by Henry II.

Christianity had been preached at an early period in the Roman parts of Germany. The influence of the heroic, disinterested benevolence of such men as Severin, who about
Christianity in Germany: Severin. the middle of the fifth century labored near the Dan-

ube, had commended the gospel to those who were enduring the distress consequent on the barbarian invasions, and the general breaking up of society. Many monks came over from England and Ireland, of whom Columban was the most influential. While in Burgundy he founded several monasteries, the most notable of which was that of Luxeuil. The degeneracy of the Frankish ecclesiastics brought him into conflict with them. They made his Irish custom of observing Easter a pretext for attack. In the controversy which followed with Rome, he showed a firm and independent spirit. He did not hesitate to rebuke the vices of the Burgundian ruling family. For this he was driven into exile, and spent the rest of his days laboring in Switzerland and Northern Italy. The name of a Swiss canton, St. Gall, recalls that of his foremost disciple.

A successful missionary work was finally established in West Friesland through the labors of Willibrord, a Saxon monk. He

Willibrord.

was made Bishop of Utrecht, and devoted himself with self-sacrificing zeal to the work of his diocese until his death in 739. Others also strove to spread Christianity in these regions, but their work lacked method, and its results were often swept away by sudden incursions of pagan Saxons or Frisians. It seemed necessary that a practical man should appear who should give direction and permanence to the missionary efforts and should organize Christian institutions. Germany found its much-needed

Boniface.

apostle in Boniface, or Winifred, an English monk. His very faults contributed much to the success of the task which he set before him. He had an exaggerated esteem for the external unity of the Church and for its ordinances. He was ready to render a devout homage to the papal office. This legalism, so characteristic of the times, was in him somewhat relieved by a spirit of genuine Christian piety, and by a morality so strict that he did not withhold his censure of the vices and superstitions prevalent at Rome itself. Boniface gained his first missionary successes among the Hessians in 722. The Pope, Gregory II., saw in him a useful instrument for advancing the interests of Romish Christianity in this part of Germany, and of counteracting the irregularities and heresies introduced by the Irish missionaries. He

723.

therefore made him bishop, at the same time exacting an oath of fealty to him and his successors in the chair of St. Peter, and a pledge to resist all departing from the order of the Church. The Pope recommended him to the protection of the Frankish Mayor of the Palace, Charles Martel, without which he

and his monks would have frequently been exposed to the fury of the Pagans. Boniface now resumed his missionary labors. An ancient oak, consecrated to the god of thunder, proved a serious

Boniface in
Hesse and
Thuringia.

obstacle to his work in Upper Hesse. The people were accustomed to regard it with peculiar awe, and to gather near by in their popular assemblies. Assisted by his

followers, Boniface hewed it down in the presence of the astonished Pagans, and out of the timber built a church. His work in Hesse, and later in Thuringia, was so successful, and his usefulness to the Pope so apparent, that Gregory III. made him Archbishop and Apostolic Vicar. He now proceeded to regulate the

Organization
of the Ger-
man Church.

ecclesiastical affairs of Germany. But it was not possible, during Charles Martel's life, fully to establish his

authority as papal legate. Carloman and Pepin, however, earnestly co-operated with him in his efforts at reform. In 742 he assembled the first German council. He also undertook to reform the Frankish Church. The fame of the good work which he did there is somewhat tarnished by his efforts to bring to submission or punishment men like Adelbert, the Frank, and Clement, a clergyman from Ireland, who retained a more independent Christian spirit in their opinions and lives. In 745 he made Mentz the seat of his archiepiscopal residence. In 753, moved by a restless desire to preach among the people whom he had sought to convert in his first missionary labors, he turned over the duties of his office to Lullus, his disciple. Two years later, he found a martyr's death at the

Monasteries
in Germany.

hands of the still pagan Frisians. Boniface had established many cloisters. Through the efforts of his de-

voted follower, Sturm, there arose, in the midst of a wilderness, the great monastery of Fulda. The labors of the monks under the direction of their abbot gradually changed the character of the whole region. The schools which Boniface and his pupils established in connection with such monasteries, did much to promote the cause of education in Germany.

In the latter part of this century, attempts were made to convert the Saxons. They were a warlike, freedom-loving people. They

Christianity
among the
Saxons.

associated Christianity with the hated Frankish dominion. The defence of their country and their homes against the armies of Charlemagne, and of their worship

against the priests of the Church, was prompted by mingled impulses of patriotism and religion. As fast as Charlemagne reduced them to subjection, he compelled them to be baptized. The severest laws were enacted against a return to the ancestral religion.

These violent measures were opposed by Alcuin, one of the wise men whom Charlemagne gathered about him. The labors of Luidger and Willehad were more productive of real Christianity among the Saxons than were the arms of Charlemagne. Willehad's work lay near Bremen, and there, after the suppression of the insurrection

787. of Wittekind, a diocese was marked out over which he was placed as bishop; and yet it was not until after a series of wars, lasting for thirty years, that, in the peace of Selz, the Saxons submitted to the Frankish power and to Christianity.

804. The story of the spread of the gospel among the Avars who dwelt in Hungary is similar. Its further progress to the north and east was stopped by the determined resistance of the Slavonian tribes.

In the seventh century there suddenly appeared in the East a new religion. Inspired by the genius and by the passionate fanaticism of Mohammed, a band of warring Arabian tribes became a nation bent on conquering the world to the belief in one God and to the acknowledgment of his prophet. Mohammed was born in Mecca, probably in the year 572, and passed his early life in obscurity. At the age of twenty-eight, by his marriage with a wealthy widow, Kadijah, he was relieved to some extent from worldly cares and obtained leisure for contemplation.

His mind was shocked by the religious indifference and degeneracy of the Arabs. The Judaism and Christianity which had penetrated into these regions were debased in doctrine as well as enervated in spiritual power. When about forty years of age, Mohammed began, as he believed, to receive from above intimations of his divine mission. At first he ascribed his strange ecstasies, which may have been in part the result of hysteria and epilepsy, disorders to which he was subject, to the influence of evil spirits. He was, however, persuaded by his wife that they were in truth revelations from God. Convinced of his supernatural call as a religious reformer, he began to preach that "There is one God, and Mohammed is his prophet." His faith he named Islam—resignation to the divine will. Slowly believers gathered about him, the first of whom were his wife, his cousin Ali, and his friend Abubekhr. The powerful Koreishites, who were rulers and elders in Mecca, now began to

Flight to
Medina.

abuse and persecute him. To save his life, in the year 622, he fled to Medina. This year thus became the date of the Hegira, or of the prophet's flight from Mecca; and from

it the Mohammedan calendar is reckoned. Being a man of commanding presence, eloquent and pleasing in manner, and withal an enthusiastic teacher and adviser, he soon became a political leader and religious reformer in this city, which was in many ways the rival of Mecca. He conceived the plan of uniting the Arab tribes by the bond of a common adherence to his cause. In this he so far succeeded that he re-entered Mecca in 630, destroyed idolatry there, and thus won the allegiance of the principal neighboring tribes. Two years later he died.

Mohammed began with the belief that he was called to exterminate idolatry in Arabia, and to bring his countrymen back to the true worship of God. Soon after he went to Medina he met with opposition on the part of the Jews, from whom he had hoped for support, and thenceforward was fired with a fanatical zeal against them. The last days of his life were filled with preparations for an expedition against the Greeks. His plan seems to have changed. He ceased to be a mere national prophet, and aspired to be the leader of a fierce crusade against the idolatry of the world. There appeared in him a mingling of lofty devotion to the will of God, and of craft and cruelty in carrying forward his own purposes.

The doctrines and ordinances of Mohammed are preserved in the Koran, the record of the revelations given to him through the angel Gabriel and accepted by his followers as the word of God. It was his purpose to restore the pure religion which he believed that God had revealed to all the prophets from Abraham to Christ. In his religious ideas and stories there is nothing original. Many of them are derived from the Jewish rabbinical writers and from the apocryphal gospels. His doctrine of God was the monotheism of the Jews, with the idea of holiness obscured, and the ideas of power and will emphasized. God rules everywhere by his omnipotent energy, and yet he is infinitely exalted above the creature. There is no mediator to reveal God to man, and to bring man to God. Later, the importance given to God's irresistible will led to an extreme form of fatalism. The prophetic mission of Mohammed was substituted for the messianic reign of righteousness and peace. The torments of hell which would afflict his idolatrous opponents, Mohammed pictured with graphic realism, while for the faithful he depicted the joys of a sensual paradise. His descriptions of the future existence were not, however, without some more spiritual features; and the polygamy which he allowed was much better than the unbridled con-

Change of
plan.

Tenets of
Mohammedanism.

cubinage which had prevailed in Arabia. He accepted much that he knew of the Old Testament saints, and acknowledged the prophetic mission of Christ, although he rejected with scorn the doctrine of his divinity. Later in his career he was loud in his condemnation of both Jews and Christians for their hardness of heart in not believing in his own divine calling.

Under the caliphs, who were the successors of Mohammed, and who combined the functions of emperor and pope, the dominion of the Moslems rapidly extended. According to the in-
Progress of Mohammedan conquests. junctions of the prophet, heathen, apostates, and schismatics were to be exterminated, while Jews and Christians were given the choice of the Koran, tribute, or death. The Arabian armies were full of unquenchable fanaticism, and a thirst for plunder and dominion. They were terrible in attack, but mild in victory. The favorite battle-cry of one of their great leaders was: "Fight, fight—Paradise, Paradise." To the victor and the slain alike the delights of heaven were promised. The successors of Mohammed united all the Arabs under their banners. The Eastern provinces of the empire, poorly supported by the emperor, fell an easy prey to the furious invaders. By 637 Damascus and Jerusalem were in the hands of the infidel. Africa, weakened by doctrinal dissension, was next invaded and conquered. The enemies of Christianity did not fare any better. Persia shared the fate of Syria and Africa. At the beginning of the eighth century the Saracens passed over into Spain, and in eight years completed the conquest of that country. Then they crossed the Pyrenees and occupied the south of Gaul. The Mohammedan power seemed to be encircling Christendom, and threatening to destroy the Church and Christianity itself. But upon the plains between Tours and
Defeat of the Moslems, 732. Poitiers, Charles with his Austrasian Franks met and defeated them so thoroughly that he was ever afterwards called Martel, or the Hammer. The tide was stemmed. Europe was saved from the danger of being overrun by the disciples of the Arabian prophet.

The Arabians had an indirect but important influence on Christianity by their devotion to the arts and sciences. Their schools, two of which were established at Granada and Cordova, were excellent, and attracted many Jewish and Christian scholars. Christians were tolerated in their countries as long as they paid tribute, offered no insult to the Moslem faith, and did not attempt to make proselytes from its votaries.

CHAPTER II.

CHRISTIAN LIFE : CHRISTIAN WORSHIP : CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY.

THE relation between Church and State in the newly formed Teutonic nations, although it was to some extent modified by the character and rising institutions of each people, was, on the whole, similar to that subsisting in the old Roman empire after the time of Constantine. Among the Franks, until the later years of this period, the Church was involved in the confusion of the State and largely dominated by political influences. The bishops and abbots, while nominally exempt from military service, were drawn into the sphere of the developing feudal relations, and were in many cases scarcely distinguishable in their aims or their morals from the great lay lords. Consequently when Pepin—and perhaps the same was true of his predecessor, Charles Martel—wished to strengthen his military power, he did not hesitate to resume ecclesiastical property, as though it were held by a simple feudal tenure. The Franks also encroached upon the freedom of Church elections, despite the occasional resistance of synods. These abuses were, however, partly remedied by the subsequent reforms, especially those undertaken by Charlemagne. In England, although the relations of Church and State were harmonious, there was no such mingling of ecclesiastical and civil functions. Owing, perhaps, to the fact that most of the Anglo-Saxon clergy were monks, they did not, like some of their Frankish brethren, gain a temporal lordship over their dioceses. The history of Spain presents still another peculiarity. The monarchy was sorely in need of moral support. The Church, therefore, strove to give it a sort of theocratic sanctity. Among the Franks for many years provincial synods ceased to be convened. Civil and ecclesiastical laws were passed indiscriminately at the general assembly of noble vassals, both lay and clerical. Such interaction in matters of legislation was more to the advantage of the State than of the Church. The reforms of Boniface and Charlemagne aimed to restore the earlier and more orderly practice. In England separate councils were held, at which princes and ealdormen were present, although it is probable that their only function was to confirm what the councils did. The Church modified beneficially the rude conceptions of justice prevailing among the Teutonic peoples. The good effect

Relation of
Church and
State.

was, however, partially neutralized by the growing tendency to withdraw the clergy from the jurisdiction of the civil courts.

The lives of the monks often presented a striking contrast with those of the secular clergy. The need of reformation, which was not so apparent in the mission churches of England and Germany, since they were largely served by monks, was especially felt in the older communities, and nowhere more than among the Franks. There the lower orders of the clergy

Deterioration
of the Frank-
ish clergy.

were recruited largely from bondmen, a practice growing out of the necessities of the government, but which could not fail to be injurious to the purity of the Church. To counteract the evil tendencies to a decline in the intelligence and character of the priest-

The canonical
life.

hood, an attempt was made, about the middle of the eighth century, to introduce the canonical form of living.

The clergy were brought together in one house and placed under regulations similar to those of the Benedictine monks, except that the clergy were allowed to retain their property. The leader in

Chrodegang,
d. 766.

instituting the canonical life was Chrodegang, Bishop of Metz. The dioceses were in many cases too large to be efficiently managed by the bishops. Unworthy men got themselves ordained by unlawful means, without reference to a particular church, and strolled about, making money by the exercise of spiritual functions. Nor was this the only source of disorder. The Frankish princes had their court chaplains, and the nobles their castle chaplains. The result was that in many cases the authority of the bishop was set at naught, and the parish churches, being frequented by the poor alone, lost their position of respectability.

Abuse of
patronage.

Those men, or their heirs, who, as founders of churches, had been given a certain oversight over the property which they had bestowed, and the right of nominating holders of its livings, often wasted the possessions, sold the offices, and attempted to make the clergy independent of the bishop. The fact of such evils gave rise to the requirement of a stricter and more frequent visitation by the bishops. Ecclesiastical courts were held and a minute inquiry made into the practices of both clergy and laity.

The metropolitan constitution, which depended for its effectiveness on the existence of great cities and a political centralization

The metro-
politan
system.

like that in the Roman empire, had become undermined in Gaul during the political disorder which had long prevailed there. Boniface, as vicar of the pope, attempted to re-establish it, but he was not so successful as was

Theodore in arranging and confirming the metropolitan system of England. No Frankish see rivalled Canterbury in fame and influence. The bishops preferred the distant authority of Rome to that of a neighboring metropolitan, unmindful of the fact that thus they were aiding in the development of a power which eventually would prove far more formidable than that of any mere provincial or national primate.

The papal power in this period not only survived the political and ecclesiastical disorder, but came out of it with added strength.

This was due largely to the three significant features of the papacy. its history: the character and foresight of its bishops, its missionary zeal which constantly won new subjects, and finally its alliance with Pepin, crowned King of the Franks. The traits

first mentioned were combined in Gregory the Great. Pope Gregory I.

He was a man who had sincerely preferred the retirement of a cloister to the position and influence which wealth and high birth conferred on him. From a life of ascetic seclusion he had been called, much against his will, to one office after another, until at last he was placed in the chair of St. Peter. A monk was now seated on the papal throne. Although not a learned man he attained to a place among the four great Latin fathers. He was imbued with a spirit of deep moral earnestness and fervent piety; and yet he was often narrow in his views, confounding the kingdom of God with the reign of the papacy. By his command, missionaries went to England, laid the foundations of the English Church, and bound it closely to Rome. He succeeded in establishing his authority in the organization and management of the Spanish Church. This Church, by the conversion of King Recared in 589, was won from adherence to the Arian heresy. Later a more independent spirit arose among the Spanish bishops. The king, Witiza, in 701 forbade all appeals to Rome. The natural result of these proceedings was, however, prevented by the invasion of the Saracens, which took place not long afterwards. Through Gregory's efforts, Gaul was brought into closer connection with Rome, and the Bishop of Arles was made apostolic vicar. With a strong hand Gregory checked the heresies and disorders which had crept into the Church. In his own diocese he was especially active, punishing the sale of Church offices—simony—and reforming the clergy and monastic orders. In Italy, the problem which was so successfully brought to a solution by later popes was skillfully dealt with by this pontiff. Although nominally subject to the Eastern emperors, the popes received no real protection from

Constantinople against the Lombards, who, even after they became Catholics, continually threatened the exarchate and Rome itself.

Relation of the Eastern and Western Churches. The relations between Gregory and the East were strained. The Bishop of Constantinople, with an oriental love of display, had assumed the title of "Universal Patriarch." Gregory protested against this infringement of the rights of the see of Peter, and henceforth took the contrasted title of "Servant of Servants," which his successors, even the most arrogant, as well as the meekest of them, have since worn.

The trouble did not end with the conclusion of Gregory's life. Later in this century a council at Constantinople passed several Second Trullan council, 682. canons which were particularly unacceptable to Rome, permitting, as they did, the marriage of priests, reaffirming the canon of the Council of Chalcedon on the rank of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and declaring against pictures of the Lamb. Pope Sergius I. forbade the proclamation of the decrees of this council in the West. This was the beginning of the movement which at length separated the two Churches. It reached its second stage when, in the first half of the next century, the great controversy about images broke out. The Roman Church vehemently defended those sacred emblems, and thus incurred the enmity of the Eastern emperor. Luitprand, the ablest of the Lombard kings, saw his opportunity. The impregnable city of Ravenna, weakened by civil strife over the iconoclastic proclamation of the Emperor Leo III., issued in 726, fell a prey to his devout professions as much as to the valor of his soldiers. Although the city was soon recaptured, the exarchate remained at the mercy of the conqueror.

The pope now found himself at enmity with his lawful ruler in the East, and exposed to the designs of the Lombard, whose power was equally dangerous, whether it appeared in open hostility, or assumed the cloak of pious reverence and friendship. The papacy and the Franks. The pontiff anxiously turned his eyes beyond the Alps to the Franks, the defenders of Christendom against the Moslem. In 741 Gregory III. was obliged to appeal, in almost piteous terms, to Charles Martel for help. But the death of Charles that same year left the union of these two great powers to be consummated by his son. Pepin was not satisfied, like his predecessors, with the mere possession of real sovereignty in the Frankish monarchy; he desired the royal crown, which was so unworthily worn by the degenerate representative of the Merovingian line. He feared, however, that his title would be insecure unless

it should receive an additional sanction such as the head of the Church could bestow. The pope well understood the value of a Frankish ally, and he did not hesitate to make the authority of St.

752. Peter felt in the affairs of a neighboring people. By his command Boniface, the apostolic vicar, anointed and crowned Pepin king; and two years later when his successor, Stephen, fled to Pepin for immediate aid against the Lombards,

754. another and more august coronation took place at Rheims. The new king twice rescued Rome from the

hands of Aistulf, the Lombard king, won back the conquered lands, and gave them to the Roman Church. This was the beginning of the long-desired temporal dominion of the popes. Upon the death of Pepin the Lombards again became aggressive. At the call of the pope, Charlemagne crossed the Alps, overturned the hostile monarchy, and established the Frankish rule in its place, at the same time confirming the grants made by his predecessor to the head of the Roman Church. Italy remained nominally subject to the Eastern emperor, but Charlemagne exercised imperial rights by virtue of his possession of the real power, and of the title of Patrician, which had been bestowed by the pope upon his father Pepin, and later upon himself, and which, although originally a name of rank, had become a title which conveyed an authority similar to that enjoyed by the exarchs at Ravenna. The climax of this great historic drama was hastened by an insurrection which nearly cost Leo III. his life. Again the pope fled beyond the Alps to the court of the Frankish monarch. Charlemagne came to Rome to re-establish order. On Christmas-day, 800, the

Coronation
of Charle-
magne.

people were gathered in the Basilica of St. Peter to hear mass. During the service the pope suddenly advanced to Charlemagne and crowned him emperor amid the acclamations of the populace. In this act Leo appeared as the representative of the Roman people. They believed it to be their right, since the empire had been usurped by a woman, Irene, to choose Charles, who possessed the real power in the West, as the successor of Constantine VI. Although the Roman empire had been scarcely more than a name in the West for three hundred years, it still had a powerful influence on the minds of men, and was deemed the necessary counterpart of the true Catholic Church. The kingdom of God was one, but it manifested itself in two directions, the temporal through the empire, and the spiritual through the papacy. On this Christmas-day there emerged two great co-ordinate powers, which did not long remain in harmony, and whose struggle for the

inastery, when it came, absorbed the attention of Europe for three hundred years. The part which Leo played in this transaction gave plausibility to the assertion of later popes that the empire had been transferred from the East to the West by the authority of the see of St. Peter.

Christianity had become so intermingled with elements of superstition and legalism that it could not quickly revolutionize the thoughts and practices of the Teutonic peoples. Too often it almost seemed to substitute merely the saints and Mary for the gods, to replace a few idols by a multitude of images and relics. The spiritual truths of the gospel could only gradually supplant the crude but deeply rooted polytheistic ideas. The clergy, whose teaching should have inculcated them, and whose lives should have exemplified them, were in many cases grossly ignorant and immoral.

The consciousness of Christ as the Redeemer became obscured. Men were less troubled by moral evil than by physical afflictions. From these they sought relief in the pity of the saints, and especially of St. Martin at Tours, whose influence in his lifetime had been felt through all Gaul. They gave lavishly to the poor, built and endowed churches, made long pilgrimages to Rome or other celebrated shrines, and all as a means of soothing an awakened conscience or of allaying fears of future retribution.

New festivals were added ; the most important being that of the Assumption of Mary, or of her miraculous ascent to heaven, as described in a fabulous tradition which had been taken up by Gregory of Tours. Those who had the welfare of christendom at heart attempted to revive Church discipline in its ancient rigor. But it was found difficult to enforce the rules of penance among the Teutonic peoples, accustomed as they were to the payment of money as a composition for even the gravest crimes. Certain exceptional cases were, therefore, recognized, in which the prescribed penance could be commuted to a money fine. Out of this simple and seemingly reasonable arrangement there was developed the system of indulgences. As the external idea of the Church more and more prevailed, the visible official acts of the priesthood were more highly prized. The Lord's Supper continued to be regarded as a sacrifice, at which prayers for the dead were especially efficacious. The clergy, persuaded by the gifts of anxious friends, said masses for the benefit of the departed, that their souls might the sooner be rescued from

State of Christian life.

Penances and indulgences.

Masses for the dead.

the pains of purgatory. This led to the custom of private masses, at which only the officiating priest was present. The pious credu-

lity and superstition of the age manifested itself in a
Ordeals.

most peculiar way in the ordeal, which was a survival of heathenism, and was taken up and embellished with additional solemnities by the Church. When it became necessary to decide a dispute or detect a criminal, and the evidence was insufficient, it was customary to resort to the judgment of God. A ring was thrown into a caldron of boiling water, and the disputant or the accused, as the case might be, was required to thrust his arm in and take it out. Or he might be compelled to walk blindfold over a number of red-hot ploughshares placed at short intervals. It was believed that through the divine intervention the guiltless man would escape all harm. It might well be that the officiating priest was sometimes venal and was well paid beforehand, or if the priest was honest, and knew his innocence, that he took pains to protect him. These superstitions needed to be counteracted by

Ignorance of
the clergy.

proper instruction, and that could only come from an educated priesthood. Some of the clergy could not understand the homilies of the Fathers, which they were appointed to read in the churches, and others were unable to explain even the Creed and the Lord's Prayer in the vulgar tongue. Praiseworthy efforts were made by some of the bishops and by Charlemagne himself to create a better-trained clergy. There were not lacking distinguished men, who rose far above their contemporaries in learning and spiritual insight. The influence of Christianity, wherever it was able to penetrate the crust of legalism and the overgrowth of superstition, purified the lives of men and nourished the germs of a nobler civilization.

These centuries were more barren in theological thought than any other period in the history of the Church. Isidore of Seville,

Theology.

Isidore,
d. 636.

John of
Damascus,
d. c. 754.

a Spanish ecclesiastic, whose writings deal with a variety of themes, compiled a collection of "Sentences," or excerpts from the Fathers, arranged under different heads, which long served as a manual for theological study. Somewhat later, an Eastern monk, John of Damascus,

who is revered as a saint in both the Greek and the Latin churches, composed in three parts a theological work called the "Fountain of Knowledge." The third portion is an "Accurate Exposition of the Orthodox Faith," a system of theology derived from the Fathers and councils from the fourth to the

seventh century. His doctrines and arguments are borrowed from these sources. For this reason, the work is full on the Trinity and the Person of Christ, but meagre on the practical topics, on which the Greek Fathers had less to say. The work of "The Damascene" was held in the Eastern Church in the highest esteem, and has retained its standing down to the present time.

About the middle of the seventh century there arose in the East the sect of Paulicians. In Mananalis, near Samosata, there was a community professing dualism. One Constantine, who belonged to it, was deeply moved by reading the epistles of Paul, and by blending his teaching with his own previous opinions he framed a dualistic system of a peculiar character. He was put to death by the command of the emperor. The system, however, continued to win adherents. The Paulicians were persecuted by a succession of Greek sovereigns. It is said that under Theodore not less than one hundred thousand of them were put to death in Grecian Armenia. Paulicians were found as late as 1204, when the Latins took Constantinople. Of the tenets of this sect we have no knowledge except from their enemies. It would appear that their dualism was more like the doctrine of the Gnostics than of the Manichæans. The Evil Being is the lord of the present visible world. Christ is sent from heaven to deliver man from the body and from the world of sense. They discarded the sacraments. In some of their customs they were ascetic, but they did not oppose marriage. They received the four gospels, and most, but not all, of the epistles, together with an epistle to the Laodiceans, which they claimed to possess.

The Pauli-
cians.

660.

THE MEDIÆVAL ERA.

PERIOD V.

FROM CHARLEMAGNE TO POPE GREGORY VII. (800–1073).

CHAPTER I.

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

THE conversion of the English and of the Germans gave Christianity vantage-ground from which to push out its missionary stations among the kindred tribes to the North and East. The gospel was often first carried thither by adventurous travellers, or by merchants, by zealous monks anxious for the crown of martyrdom, or by the followers of some conquering army.

Louis the Pious (814–840) used his imperial influence with Harold, Prince of Jutland, to promote the introduction of Christianity among the Danes. He employed as a missionary Ansgar, a monk of Corvey, and afterwards Archbishop of Hamburg. Christianity met with various vicissitudes until, under the Danish empire of Canute, the conqueror of Eng-

Christianity
in Scandina-
vian coun-
tries.

land, it became finally established in Denmark. Ansgar made two visits to Sweden, and laid the foundations of a mission on the Eastern coast. He was a man of courage and piety, and, although full of zeal, was gentle and patient. Youths who were taken in war he instructed in the principles of the gospel, so that they might preach to their fellow-countrymen. His missionary efforts were disturbed by the incursions of piratical Normans, who in one of their attacks destroyed Hamburg, the metropolitan town. Through the influence of several successive kings, Sweden at length became christianized, and was attached to the see of Bremen, to which the archbishopric had been transferred. The progress of Christianity in Norway was similar. Three of the most valiant and patriotic Norman princes,

Olaf (Tap-
king), 993–
1024.

Hacon and the two Olafs, who had become acquainted with it in their travels, endeavored to introduce it by force. Their efforts met with varying success. As the pagan Swedes had found a rallying-point in their great temple at Upsala, until its destruction in 1075, so the heathen party among the Normans was not vanquished until the sacred image of Thor fell in fragments under the blows of a Christian soldier, and out of it crept a multitude of mice, snakes, and lizards. In passing from Paganism to Christianity, there was often an intermediate stage during which Christ was worshipped along with the older divinities. From Norway, Christianity spread to Greenland and Iceland. For a time, the Icelanders stoutly contended for their ancient right to eat horse-flesh and to expose those of their children whose lives they did not value.

The conversions which had been made by Charlemagne among the Slavic nations were not more permanent than his conquests.

The Slaves who dwelt about the Danube were opposed to any connection with Germany, and their ignorance of German and Latin would prevent them from being affected by influences from that direction.

The Bulgarians coming from Central Asia settled on the borders of the East Roman empire, and adopted the Slavic language and customs. In their wars with the emperor they became acquainted with Christianity.

Afterwards, for a time, it seemed as though they would break off the relations which had arisen between them and the Eastern Church, and subject themselves to the institutions and authority of the Roman see.

For this purpose they negotiated with Pope Nicholas I.; but finally, influenced by the Emperor Basilius, they attached themselves permanently to the Greek Church.

Cyrril and Methodius, missionaries from Constantinople, went among the Moravians, reduced their language to writing, conducted the services of the Church in the native tongue of the people, and gave them a version of the Scriptures.

In 868, Methodius was made archbishop. When, later, they came into close connection with Rome, the use of the Slavic language and the Greek forms of worship was still allowed, but the efforts of Methodius to establish a national church were rendered ineffectual by the intrigues of the German bishops.

In 908 the Moravian kingdom was overthrown by the Magyars, a horde of Asiatic barbarians, and out of its ruins arose Bohemia and Hungary.

In these nations Christianity, after a severe struggle with Paganism, triumphed, largely through the influence of

their two most renowned princes, Boleslaus II. (967) and Stephen (997-1038). From Bohemia the gospel was carried to Poland, and there also became the state religion. These churches submit-

The Wends. ted to the jurisdiction of Rome. Attempts were repeatedly made to bring the Wends—Slavonian tribes which dwelt on the north and east of Germany—under the Frankish dominion, and to impose upon them the Christian religion. The great obstacle was that of language. Most missionaries were not only ignorant of the Slavic, but also were prejudiced in favor of using the Latin ritual in all the Church services. In 1047, Gottschalk, a Wendish chief, having united all the tribes under his rule, was moved to rebuild the churches which he had destroyed in his revolt against the Germans, and to found permanent Christian institutions. But he fell a victim to his zeal, and with

his death his people returned to Paganism. Nor did they submit to the gospel until after desolating wars had left but few of them alive, and their lands had been settled anew by German colonists.

In the meantime, the Russians had received Christianity from the East. The conversion of King Vladimir (988) marks the date of its proper establishment. He was drawn toward it largely by the magnificence and impressiveness of the ritual of the Church of St. Sophia at Constantinople, as it was described to him by his ambassadors. Fortunately the Scriptures were at hand in the Slavic version of Cyrill, and the king, not satisfied with the mere externals of Christianity, made use of this version that his people might be properly instructed in the truths of the new religion.

The gospel was carried in the twelfth century to the Pomeranians, who had come under the power of Poland. The first mission-

The Pomeranians. aries, men of ascetic habits and dressed in squalid clothing, only succeeded in arousing the contempt of this simple, pleasure-loving people. When, however, Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, and friend of the Emperor Henry IV., went among them in episcopal pomp, supported by the authority of Poland, and at the same time manifesting a spirit of unselfish devotion, the Pomeranians were gradually won over to the new faith. In attempting to Christianize the Livonians and Prussians an instrumentality very characteristic of the times was used. Out of the crusading enthusiasm of the twelfth century sprung an order of knights called

Livonians. "Brethren of the Sword." By their military valor Livonia was subjugated and its new bishoprics protected.

In conquering Prussia, another association of German knights, of

similar origin, co-operated, in the thirteenth century, with these veteran spiritual warriors. The less important tribes of this part of Europe gradually embraced Christianity, influenced by the example or coerced by the authority of their more powerful neighbors.

In Spain, although the Moslem rule proved a check to the growing power of Christianity, still, down to the year 850, the Church remained undisturbed. Christians filled military and civil offices without suspicion or offence. And yet bitter divisions frequently sprung up in families where one parent followed Mohammed and the other followed Christ. The Moslems often showed their contempt for Christianity, and in return received insult from its more hot-blooded adherents. Christians were divided into two parties in regard to the proper attitude to be taken towards Mohammedanism. Some were for boldly confessing Christ and denouncing the false prophet, while others advocated a more quiet and inoffensive conduct. The latter, however, when led by circumstances to state their real beliefs were ready to do so, and of their number were the first martyrs. A fanatical desire for martyrdom now arose in the hearts of others, and especially of the monks who came out from the mountains. The more sober-minded Christians opposed the extravagance; and in 852, when there was danger of a general persecution, the Council of Cordova forbade Christians to appear before the magistrate to confess their faith unless they were judicially summoned. The excitement cooled down and the Christians again enjoyed religious freedom.

Nestorian missionaries penetrated into Northern and Eastern Asia. During the early years of the eleventh century, they succeeded in converting a Tartar or Mongol Prince. Exaggerated reports of this prince and of his nation became so current in the West that Pope Alexander III. invited him to put himself under the authority of the see of St. Peter. As Prester John, the popular translation of his name, which was Gur Khan, he was the hero of legends and poems. But his partly fabulous greatness was soon eclipsed by the establishment of a powerful Mongol empire under Ghengis Khan and his successors, which at one time threatened the safety of Europe. High hopes were entertained in the West of converting these mighty potentates. Mendicant friars were for this purpose sent out by the Roman Church and by St. Louis of France. The Mongol religion was simple. It recognized one Almighty Creator and held the Khan to be his son, the appointed ruler of the world. The Mongols, governed by their desire to extend their influence

Christianity
in Spain.

The Mongols.
Prester John.

Empire of
Ghengis
Khan, 1202.

and conquests, were reluctant to embrace either Mohammedanism or Christianity. They founded two empires, one in Persia, the other in China. In the former, Mohammedanism triumphed, while in the latter Christianity for a time, through the efforts of the celebrated missionary, John de Monte Corvino, made hopeful progress. He labored in Peking eleven years, striving to educate the children and to train up missionaries from among the people themselves. He sought to promote a true knowledge of the gospel, and to this end he translated the New Testament into the Tartar language. But the little community over which he had been made archbishop by Clement V. perished in a subsequent Chinese insurrection.

1307.

A few missionaries accompanied the crusaders to the East to preach the gospel to the Mohammedans as they should have opportunity. During the siege of Damietta, Francis of Assisi ventured to enter the camp of a hostile army. He was seized and hurried before the Sultan of Egypt, who, strange to say, treated him with respect, listened to his preaching, and after several days dismissed him with honor to his friends. But missionary efforts could not well be combined with warlike aims, nor could Christianity be much recommended by the lives of the crusaders.

1219.

A more hopeful plan was cherished by Raymond Lull. In him we see a man brilliant and prosperous, devoted to the pleasures of the world, suddenly turning his back on all his former life and its associations, and becoming wholly absorbed in the philosophical defence of Christianity, and in schemes for the conversion of the Saracens. To prepare men for this work, he urged upon the leaders of the Church the establishment of schools where Arabic should be taught. His words at last succeeded in winning from the pope an ordinance for the founding of professorships of Oriental languages in the principal schools of the West. He did not long survive this partial realization of his plans. Led by his desire to carry the gospel to the Saracens, he visited Africa, whither he had twice gone before on the same errand, and while preaching was stoned to death by a mob of infuriated Moslems.

Raymond
Lull,
1236-1315.

The Jews, who were scattered in great numbers throughout the West, were despised and hated. They bent all their energies to the accumulation of wealth by money-lending and trading, being driven to these employments as their only means of livelihood. Their riches often exposed them to the covetousness of powerful and unscrupulous men. They were accused

The Jews.

of unnatural crimes; they were tortured and murdered. None were more zealous in their persecution than the crusaders. This cruel oppression went on despite the efforts of popes, and sometimes of princes, to whom their wealth was frequently useful. Such trials only confirmed them in their isolation from mankind, and made them cling all the more tenaciously to their ancient exclusive customs and to their tenets and hopes.

CHAPTER II.

THE POLITY OF THE CHURCH, AND THE RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO THE CIVIL AUTHORITY.

THE imperial dignity gave Charlemagne a strong sense of his duty as protector and defender of the Church and its members, but it could add little to the control in ecclesiastical affairs of which he was already possessed. He received of the popes their oaths of allegiance, and admonished them often of their duty even in matters of doctrine. Whatever visions of spiritual ascendancy floated before their eyes, and whatever plans they may have cherished for its achievement it was not then the time to realize them. But the strength and integrity of the empire were more dependent upon the genius of Charlemagne than the dominion of the papacy was contingent on the character and sagacity of any one pope. Charlemagne died in 814, and after a few years his empire was broken up by warring factions.

Although his immediate successors maintained to some extent the same supremacy in the affairs of the Church, the popes improved every opportunity afforded by the disorders of the times to make themselves more independent. In this aspiration they were favored by the hostility of the Romans to the rule of the Franks. They were, however, not content with mere negative advantages, but were gradually striving for power in imperial politics and in the administration of justice. The criminal who fled to them for protection, having received the papal absolution, might bid defiance to the authority of the secular courts. The bold attempt of Gregory IV., in 833, to interpose between Louis the Pious and his rebellious sons, called forth the indignant protests of the Frankish bishops, but it helped the cause which the pontiff supported. The principle that the crowns of kings are sub-

Control of
Charlemagne
in Church
affairs.

The popes
after Charle-
magne's
death.

ject to the arbitrament of bishops, which these princes adopted as a means of deposing their father, and the desire of successive emperors to gain the inviolability supposed to be conferred by the papal unction, could not fail in the end to promote the pretensions of the papacy. Louis II., in writing to the Greek emperor, Basil, went so far as to say : "By the laying on of hands and by the consecration of the supreme pontiff are we brought to this eminence."

The movement of the age was toward papal ascendancy. The pious looked with alarm on the growing spirit of faction. They thoroughly believed in the superiority of the Church to the State,

and were eager to maintain the sacredness of the priesthood and the supremacy of the successors of St. Peter.

It was this spirit which produced the Pseudo-Isidorian decretals. Previous editors of ecclesiastical laws, following the example of Dionysius Exiguus, had begun their collections from the reign of the Roman bishop, Siricius, which extended from 384 to 398 ; but the author of this edition boldly cited decrees, purporting to emanate from his predecessors, back to Clement, second in the succession from St. Peter himself. Although the forgeries were clumsy, and abounded with anachronisms, the spurious character of the documents escaped detection in that uncritical age, and for centuries after. The design of the decretals was twofold. The priesthood was declared to be inviolable and freed from secular control. Infringements of its personal or property rights were asserted to be sins against the ordinance of God. The validity and effect of the official acts and words of the clergy were regarded as in nowise dependent upon their personal character. To complete the hierarchical idea, the priesthood was looked upon as comprising definite grades of official dignity, and as rising through inferior clergy, priests, bishops, metropolitans, and primates, to the successor of Peter, to whom every inferior might appeal, and without whose sanction no verdict was final. From him as the fountain, justice and mercy flowed through the bishops and other clergy as channels that conveyed the blessing. The most advanced pretensions ever propounded or hinted at by the most ambitious pontiffs were here explicitly and systematically set forth in spurious letters and decrees to which the names of venerated bishops of the early Church were attached. The ideas which they embodied gradually worked their way into capitularies, canons, and papal decisions. The unity of the Church was thus emphatically set forth at a time when the different peoples were becoming filled with purely local aims.

The Pseudo-Isidorian decretals.

The donation of Constantine, a still bolder fiction, was first alluded to in these decretals, and soon after the deed of gift was taken up into the collection. According to its terms, The donation of Constantine. Constantine generously gives to Sylvester I., who was Roman bishop from 314 to 335, the provinces which make up the occidental Roman empire, and with them all the imperial insignia. He exalts the dignity of the pope above that of the emperor, and that no earthly potentate may rule where the divinely appointed head of Christendom resides, he removes the seat of the empire to Constantinople. This forgery was not at first so influential as the decretals, because it was less insidious in its workings. Although the decretals stood in contradiction to the earlier ecclesiastical laws and methods of procedure, yet the selfish rivalries of princes and prelates gave a field for the exercise of extravagant pretensions and the establishment of dangerous precedents.

The first pope who clearly comprehended and resolutely asserted these ideas, and quoted the decretals themselves in their defence, was Nicholas I. He came into conflict with Hincmar, Nicholas I., 858-867. Archbishop of Rheims, who had deposed Rothad, Bishop of Soissons. Rothad made his appeal to Rome, and the pope ordered him to be reinstated. He met with less opposition because he was espousing the cause of bishops against a haughty metropolitan. The archbishops, at their investiture with the pallium, were now admonished of the duty of obedience to the Roman see. Nicholas availed himself of the power of judgment in important causes, which the Frank rulers had granted to their prelates, to interfere as the champion of the slandered and persecuted wife of King Lothair II., who desired to cast her off for the sake of a mistress. The pope, despite the threats of the emperor, deposed the Archbishops of Treves and Cologne, who were the guilty instruments which the king employed to carry out his unworthy purposes. Nicholas, aided by public opinion and by the fears of Lothair, whose uncles were his political rivals, succeeded in maintaining the cause of the injured wife, although he died before the trouble was ended. But the circumstances which favored Nicholas were wanting in the case of his successor. Hadrian II., 867-872. Hadrian II. ignominiously failed in his interference to withstand an unrighteous greed for territory on the part of Charles the Bald and Louis the German, as well as in his attempt to restore the deposed Bishop of Laon. Charles's anger soon passed away, and when he ascended the imperial throne, John

VIII., who crowned him, declared that the emperor owed his crown to him alone. Contrary to the wishes of his own prelates, he appointed the Archbishop of Sens primate of the Frankish and German Churches and apostolic vicar, and by many other regulations helped forward the very pretensions that he before had spurned, and even now did not permit to be fully realized.

After the deposition of Charles the Fat, in 887, the power of the Italian nobles gradually increased until they became independent. A wild conflict of Italian parties ensued, in which the papacy was involved. The bark of St. Peter, as Romanist writers have expressed it, was tossed on a sea of fiercely contending factions. For many years the popes were the paramours, or the sons and grandsons, of three voluptuous and ambitious Roman women. John XII., one of the vilest of all these pontiffs, called in Otho I., King of Germany, to protect him against Berengar II. of Italy. He soon after conspired to drive out the Germans, whom he had so recently invited. Otho took swift vengeance. He called a synod in St. Peter's Church, at which John was deposed on charges of murder, blasphemy, and gross sensuality. But John, before his fall, had crowned Otho emperor, an act of no less significance than the like proceeding of Leo one hundred and sixty-two years before.

The Holy Roman empire, which now came into being, was not in reality a world-wide empire corresponding to a world-wide religion. Its limits were narrower than those of the Frankish Roman empire of Charlemagne. But its theoretical relations to the Church, its rights and obligations, were now more clearly comprehended. As there was but one true Catholic Church, so there was but one Holy Empire. In theory there could be no conflict between the two sovereignties. God had set the pope over the spiritual interests of the world, and the emperor over its temporal affairs. The pope was so to guide and rule men's souls that they should attain to eternal life; the emperor was to govern their outward relations in such a way that their spiritual life would be most effectively promoted. It was the theory of the harmonious co-operation of the two great world-rulers, each in his distinct sphere, to bring in the kingdom of God on earth. A beautiful thought, to which the practices of both emperors and popes often presented a sad contrast! But it was the ideas embodied in the fabric of the Holy Roman Empire, which, more than anything else except the missionary labors of the Church, saved the papacy from

John VIII.,
872-882.

960.

962.

The Holy Roman
empire.

being ruined in long periods of corruption. Otho's career as emperor was not such as the theory would have called for. The imperial crown was bestowed on him by the pope more clearly than the crown of Charlemagne was granted by Leo; but Otho was active in deposing the same pope, and it was only by means of Otho's authority that Leo VIII., and those who immediately followed him were able to maintain themselves in the chair of St. Peter. When the emperor died (973), the spirit of disorder again broke out at Rome.

The deposition of Arnulf, Archbishop of Rheims, by a synod, in disregard of papal authority, led to a conflict with the independent party in the French Church, which, under the
991. guidance of Gerbert, a man of learning and force of character, supported the synod against the papacy. The result, however, showed that the papacy, despite its many years of almost fatal corruption, had not lost its power. The decrees of John XV. deprived Gerbert of his moral support, even if they failed to reduce

him and his king, Hugh Capet, to subjection. Otho III.
996. had in the meantime established his imperial authority in Italy, and on the death of John XV. had procured the consecration of his cousin as Gregory V. Gregory proceeded to the sternest measures, threatening to put the French Church under the ban. Robert, Hugh Capet's successor, moved by personal hopes, and by
997. fears of Otho III., yielded, and Arnulf was restored.

Gerbert lost his cause and the see of Rheims, but only, strange as it may seem, to be the next in succession to the see of Rome. His striking career was the wonder of the age, and the ignorant long believed that he had prospered through a compact with the devil.

Otho III. died in 1002, and his pope died soon after. The German dominion was again cast off and a new era of papal degradation followed. A boy of twelve, precocious in crime, ascended the papal throne as Benedict IX. In a few years his pleasures were interrupted by the pretensions of a rival, and, wearied of the office, he sold it to John Gratian, who took the name of Gregory VI. Gratian desired to use the papal power as a means of introducing reforms. Benedict repented of
1046. his bargain. At this juncture Henry III. came down to Italy, summoned the synod of Sutri, and deposed the three rival pontiffs. A decree of the synod gave him, as the champion of reform, the right of choosing succeeding popes. Henry, now crowned emperor by the newly elected pontiff, Clement II., was master in

Intervention
of Henry
III.

Church and State as none of the emperors before or after him ever were. Under his protection the party anxious to put an end to the evils that afflicted the Church grew in strength. In 1048

Hildebrand, Bruno, a cousin of the emperor, having been made pope

at the Diet of Worms, was persuaded by a young monk not to consider himself qualified to assume the office until he should be properly elected at Rome, and to travel thither in the garb of a pilgrim, thus practically disowning the right of the emperor to appoint the head of the Church. The new pope, Leo IX., took the advice, and brought the sagacious monk with him as a subdeacon. This zealous ecclesiastic was Hildebrand, a carpenter's son and a Benedictine, who, with Cardinal Peter Damiani, Bishop of Ostia, became the great promoter of all subsequent reforms. The pope, influenced by these counsellors, endeavored to put an end to simony and to the immorality of the clergy, including under the latter head the marriage of priests, which was contrary to the canon law. During Leo's reign, Hildebrand rapidly gained a commanding influence, and bent all his energies to the purification of the

Church and the advancement of the papal authority. He

1054. selected, as successor of Leo, Gebhardt, Bishop of Eichstadt, an eminent German prelate, and the influential counsellor of Henry III., hoping thus to win over to the interest of Rome the most powerful member of the party dangerous to Roman pretensions. In 1056 Henry III. died, leaving the empire to his son, who was only six years old. This gave the reformers an opportunity to carry out the second portion of their plan. They had purified the papacy; they now resolved to shake off its dependence on the emperors. After the death of Stephen IX. they succeeded in elect-

1059. ing a man devoted to their policy, Nicholas II., and in forcing the rival pope, Benedict, who had been elected by the opposing party, to submit.

By the decree of a Roman synod, passed in the same year, the election of the pope was placed in the hands of the college of Cardinals, which was composed of the priests and deacons of the Roman Church and seven suburbicarian bishops.

Rules for the
choice of a
pope.

The cardinal-bishops were to take the initiative in the election; the consent of the cardinal-priests and deacons was then required; then assent on the part of the laity, and finally a like assent of the emperor. The pope was to be taken from the clergy of Rome if possible, and there the election was to be held unless disorders made this impracticable. A great revolution was begun. The power which Henry III. had wielded over the papacy was no

more acknowledged, and the struggle between the Empire and the Church was now to commence. Rome entered into an alliance with Robert Guiscard, the Norman duke of Lower Italy, and in this new vassal found a counterpoise to the empire. The party of Hildebrand went to work to arouse the anger and contempt of the people against the clergy who had got their offices by simony, or had wives. Great disturbances occurred in Milan, where every ecclesiastic, from the bishop to the deacons, had paid for the Church office he held, and where there were also many married clergy. The triumph of Rome was for a time complete, when the guilty priests had to receive absolution at the hands of the papal legate, Cardinal Damiani. The death of Nicholas gave occasion for the new law about elections to be tried for the first time. The cardinals elected Alexander II. The imperial party, at a council held in Basle, chose the Bishop of Parma under the name of Honorius II. Through the machinations of powerful German prelates and nobles, who were anxious to weaken the imperial power, Alexander was given the advantage in the ensuing struggle. He overcame his rival and was recognized by the emperor. Hildebrand became archdeacon. The pope withstood the purposes and actions of Henry IV. He refused, through his legate, to countenance Henry's attempt to get a divorce, and upon the complaint of the disaffected Saxons, summoned him to Rome to answer charges of simony and oppression. But Alexander suddenly died, leaving this trouble to be settled by his successor.

Alliance of
the pope
with the Nor-
mans.

1061.

Alexander
II. and
Henry IV.

1073.

The feudal
system and
the clergy.

In this period the feudal system materially affected the relations of the clergy to the state, and consequently their character, and the manner in which they administered the rapidly increasing possessions of the Church.

Bishops were often made counts or dukes of their dioceses, enjoying the same privileges and performing the same duties as secular lords, and, like them, using intrigue and violence to further their ambitious schemes. As noble vassals they took the usual oath of allegiance to the king or emperor, and were invested by him with the ring and staff, which, though they were symbols of spiritual functions, were in this feudal relation the sign of administrative authority in the secular province. The German kings gave many important fiefs to their prelates, hoping to find in them a bulwark against the encroachments of the powerful lay nobles. Al-

though the clergy were thus brought into close connection with the secular power, spiritual offices, up to the time of Henry IV., were less frequently sold in Germany than elsewhere, especially in France and Italy. The bishops and abbots, in order to raise the military contingents which they owed their suzerains, were sometimes obliged to bestow Church property in fief, thus putting it in danger of misappropriation or of complete alienation. Feudalism was itself modified in turn by influences from the Church. Its disintegrating tendencies were met by the idea of unity, which was characteristic of the Church. Some of the evils, like the right of private war, which had sprung up as a part of the feudal system, were checked by the growing power of Christian principles.

The "truce of God"—from sunset of Wednesday until Monday—sought to commemorate the days of Christ's trial and victory by an abstinence from all violence. The internal organization of the Church was in this period partially demoralized. The bishops in becoming great nobles lost control of the clergy of their dioceses. The canonical form of living degenerated into a society for advancing individual ambition. The monks no longer set an example of greater purity of life. Monasticism had everywhere fallen into decay; wealthy foundations became a prey to the cupidity of the powerful, who used the position of abbot as a means of personal enrichment. There were repeated attempts to reform the monastic life, and out of these grew the associations of monasteries, the most noted of which was the congregation of Clugny.

The truce
of God.

CHAPTER III.

CHRISTIAN LIFE AND WORSHIP: CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

THE social, political, and ecclesiastical confusion, the decreasing use of Latin, and the undeveloped state of the new languages account for the ignorance which prevailed in the tenth century. The power of Christianity was crippled by superstition. The common people too generally made religion to consist in adoring images, gathering relics, hearing and telling legends of miracles, and in going on pilgrimages. The number of the saints rapidly multiplied. Hitherto their memory had been cherished principally in those churches and countries with which their lives had been associated; but now, in accordance

Ignorance
and super-
stition.

with the dominant hierarchical idea, they began to be canonized by the popes and to receive the homage of the entire Church collectively. Ulrich of Augsburg was the first to be raised to this dignity by a decree of John XV. In some churches the ideas of God were so gross that when Raterius of Verona preached the truth that God is a spirit, certain of his clergy protested, saying, "What shall we do? We thought we knew something about God, but God is nothing at all if he has not a head." With ignorance were connected immorality and crime. The same Raterius cried out in despair over the stupidity and licentiousness of the clergy, the wickedness of the people, and the negligence of the bishops. The attempts which were made to enforce the rule of celibacy had a baneful effect on clerical morals. Those churches where the clergy were allowed to marry were in general the most enlightened and the best managed. Even Damiani, bitter as he was against the marriage of priests, was forced to testify to the honesty and intelligence of the clergy of Lucca and Turin, where it was countenanced.

The interdict proved to be a powerful weapon against lawless nobles who would not submit to the ordinary discipline of the Church. Attempts were made by the leading men and by councils to urge upon the bishops and other clergy the duty of preaching the gospel and the necessity of properly instructing the people in the truths of Christianity. In England, King Alfred was especially successful in reviving the interest in learning. Moved by the same spirit, Otfried, an Alsatian monk, in the ninth century, composed a poetical paraphrase of the gospels for the Franks. Although the records of this age abound in proofs of wide-spread ignorance and demoralization, we are by no means to conclude that the light did not shine in many places. There were not only faithful ecclesiastics, but also Christian laymen, whose well-ordered lives preserved the genuine spirit of piety, even if these exemplary men have no place on the pages of the polemic or the chronicler.

The rupture between the Eastern and Western Churches was consummated near the close of this period. In the great controversy respecting the use of images, the Western Church had not taken sides with iconoclasts, but had been lukewarm in its sympathy with their fanatical opponents. The victories of Islam, by which Syria, Persia, Egypt and North Africa were subdued, chiefly affected the Eastern Empire. Under

Canonization.

Raterius,
d. 974.

The interdict.

Efforts of
good men.

King Alfred,
871-901.

The Greek
and Latin
Churches.

the rule of its despotic princes, it preserved its own polity independently of the West. No institution analogous to the papacy could build itself up in the East ; yet the rank of the patriarchate of Constantinople was a barrier in the way of the extension of Roman ecclesiastical sovereignty in that region. The growth of the papacy in the West was a principal obstacle to the continuance of the unity of the Greek and the Latin Churches. An outbreak of dissension occurred in the ninth century, in which the most prominent figure is Photius, a learned scholar and a man of talents, who, from being captain of the guard, was raised to the office of patriarch at Constantinople. His elevation was consequent on the expulsion of Ignatius from this station, on account of his faithful and courageous conduct in a conflict with Bardas, the iniquitous uncle of the young emperor, Michael III. Photius sought the countenance of Pope Nicholas I., whose assertion of the Pseudo-Isidorian prerogative and decision adverse to the wishes of the usurping patriarch, excited his fierce indignation. In 863, Nicholas, at a synod at Rome, excommunicated him. Photius in his turn promulgated an encyclical letter, in which he charged the Latin Church with heresy, for its rule of celibacy, its interpolation of the Nicene Creed, and for various ritual peculiarities. The next year Photius caused the pope to be excommunicated by a synod at Constantinople. After various turns of fortune in the contest between Photius and his enemies, and restoration of amity with Rome, the pope renewed the ban against him, which was never recalled. The Bulgarians were conquered by the Emperor Basil in 1019, and their Church was subject to Constantinople for nearly two centuries afterward. The Russians and other Slavonian nations, which embraced the gospel, enlarged the territory of the Eastern Church. In the middle of the eleventh century, the contest with Rome was renewed by Michael Cærularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, by whose agency the Latin liturgy was abolished in certain Bulgarian churches and monasteries, and who addressed to the Bishop of Trani, in Apulia, a letter in which he inveighed against the errors of the Latins, adding to the customary list the use of unleavened bread in the sacrament. The papal ambassadors left on the altar of the church of St. Sophia a bull excommunicating the patriarch. This called out from him a like anathema, an act in which he was supported by the other patriarchs of the East. By this proceeding the Greek and Latin Churches were permanently divided.

We have already had occasion to advert to most of the names

prominent in this period in connection with learning and theology.

The Anglo-Saxon monk, the Venerable Bede, sent forth
Bede, 673-735.

from the cloister of Yarrow, where he preferred to be a laborious student instead of taking on him the responsibilities of an abbot, works which evinced a mastery of all the science of the time, and made him an author revered in all the countries of the West. His distinctly theological treatises are of small value in comparison with his "Ecclesiastical History of the English," which is carried down to 731, which was four years before his death. The intellectual revival under the auspices of Charlemagne had the effect to bring forward a considerable number of meritorious scholars

and theologians. It was in 782 that Alcuin, an English-
Alcuin, c. 735-804. man, who received his education at York, and met Charlemagne for the first time in Italy, became the head of the palatial school that attended the emperor's migratory court. His most interesting productions are his letters. He was versed in the classical poets; his own style is superior to that of the contemporary writers, and his influence in promoting the cause of learning was greater than that of any other of the eminent men of the time. His last days were spent as abbot of the monastery of

St. Martin at Tours. Claudius of Turin, a Spaniard by
Claudius of Turin, d. 839. birth, owed his ecclesiastical station to Charlemagne's son, the Emperor Louis, at whose court in Aquitania, before the death of Charlemagne, he had resided as an interpreter of Scripture in the palatial school. In his episcopal office he proved himself not only an energetic opponent of image-worship, but, also, of so many other abuses in doctrine and practice that he deserves to be known as a forerunner, in a distant age, of the Protestant reformers. He wrote commentaries on almost all the books of the Bible; but of his writings unfortunately only fragments remain.

The mental activity aroused in the age of Charlemagne manifested itself in several controversies, in which a number of the leading theologians were concerned. The first of these was

Adoptianist controversy, 782-799.

the adoptian controversy which was begun in Spain, but spread among the Franks. Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, was the author, and Felix, Bishop of Urgel, was the most active defender, of an opinion which resembled that of Nestorius, and may have been due in part to Nestorian influences. They affirmed that Christ as divine is the natural son of God, but, as human, is the adopted son of God. Felix twice recanted his opinion; the second time, in 799, at a council at Aix-la-Chapelle, after a debate with Alcuin. It was condemned by the popes and synods.

Elipandus, safe in his own diocese, adhered to his view to the end.

A second controversy of a more serious character, and the events of which were more painful, related to predestination. Gottschalk, a pious and learned monk of Orbais, in the province of Rheims, became an earnest advocate of the Augustinian doctrine on this subject. In his language he went somewhat further than Augustine, especially in asserting a "predestination" of the wicked to perdition as the penalty of their sin, and in affirming that foreknowledge and predestination are inseparable; although there is no proof that he denied to Adam, prior to the fall, the freedom which the Latin Father had ascribed to him. In short, his doctrine was substantially identical with that of Augustine, while his opponents planted themselves on Augustinism as modified by the mingling of Semi-Pelagian elements of belief. One of these adversaries was Rabanus Maurus, abbot of the monastery of Fulda, a prominent theologian, sincere in his opinions, but having a private grudge against Gottschalk. He refused to recant at the synod of Chiersy, where Hincmar, the overbearing and intolerant, but powerful, Archbishop of Rheims, who disliked him, was the ruling spirit. Refusing to abjure his convictions, Gottschalk was scourged with a merciless severity that nearly killed him, and was then cast into prison, where he remained, unshaken in his faith, until his death, twenty years later. He was no doubt a godly and persecuted man.

A third important controversy was on the subject of the eucharist. Paschasius Radbertus, one of the ablest and best educated men of the ninth century, abbot of the French monastery at Corbie, published a work in which the doctrine of transubstantiation was distinctly advocated. On the other side, Ratramnus, a monk at Corbie, defended the Augustinian opinion that the Word, or Logos, dwells in the consecrated bread and wine, as once the Logos dwelt in the body of Christ, while they still continue, in substance as well as attributes, bread and wine. This position of Ratramnus was maintained by leading writers and scholars of that age, among whom were Christian Druthmar and Florus Magister. On the other hand, Radbert's opinion was espoused by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, and other prominent ecclesiastics. It increased in popularity, and was advocated, in the tenth century, by such leaders in the Church as Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, and the learned Gerbert, afterwards Pope Sylvester II. More and more it came to be considered the orthodox opinion. It is worthy of

Controversy
on predesti-
nation.
847-868.

831.

mention, as characteristic of the times, that in the discussion brought on by Radbert there were grave and heated debates on the question whether the whole of the bread and wine taken in the sacrament are, or are not, assimilated by the digestive organs.

The ablest theologian of the Carolingian age, and one whose speculations belong rather to a later period of philosophical thought, was John Scotus Erigena—the last term signifying, probably, “born in the Isle of Saints.” It implies that his birthplace was Ireland, which was often called Greater Scotland (Major Scotia). Shortly before the middle of the ninth century he took up his residence at the court of Charles the Bald. That he was not wanting in wit is evinced by his repartee on being jocosely asked by the king, who sat on the other side of the table, “How differs”—or, more literally, what parts—“Scot from sot?” “Table” (*mensa*), was the response of Scotus to this metaphysical query. He translated, at the request of Charles, the writings of Pseudo-Dionysius, which is one of the proofs of his knowledge of Greek. Thus he did much to introduce a vein of mystical New Platonism into the theology of the mediæval period. His principal original work is entitled, “Concerning the Division of Nature.” He distinguishes between the faith, which rests on authority, and marks the earlier stage of intellectual life, from reason, which sees things in their necessary grounds and relations. The universe is unfolded from God, the uncreated, absolute being, respecting whom all our affirmations are the language of appearance. From him the ideal world emanates, which is realized in the things of time and sense. In the last movement in the cycle, all things revert back to God. He was no doubt a devout man in his way, but his system is Pantheistic in its real character. It bears a strong resemblance to the speculative systems of Schelling and other modern German philosophers of the Pantheistic schools. Its true character, however, was not clearly perceived, especially at first, by his contemporaries. But when he took up the defence of predestination, in support of Hincmar against Gottschalk, and rested his argument on the denial to God of any such thing as foreknowledge or predetermination, the orthodox looked on this ally with suspicion. Finally, his views on this subject were condemned by the Synod of Valence, and soon after by Pope Nicholas I. He died in England, about 891. Scotus has been erroneously ranked as “father of the schoolmen.” His idea of faith and reason was more like that of the early Alexandrian Fathers.

855.

859.

His place is on the roll of speculative thinkers. His very existence in the ninth century is an anachronism.

Of the Greek ecclesiastical writers in this period, the most valuable is Photius, the celebrated Archbishop of Constantinople ; and of his writings the best known and most useful is the Greek writers. “Myriobiblion,” which is made up of excerpts, with summaries or abridgments, from not less than two hundred and seventy-nine heathen and Christian books, many of which have since perished.

Photius died in 891. The list of Byzantine historians, to whose industry we are chiefly indebted for our knowledge of Byzantine history after the fall of the Western empire, begins in the reign of Justinian and extends through the middle ages. In the period which we are now describing, Simeon Metaphrastes wrote his lives of the saints and martyrs, and Michael b. 1020.

Psellus, a prolific author—not to speak of other writings from his pen—was one of the first of a series of commentators on the Bible who rendered no little service to sacred learning.

PERIOD VI.

FROM GREGORY VII. TO BONIFACE VIII. (1073-1294)

THE FULL SWAY OF THE PAPACY IN WESTERN EUROPE.

CHAPTER I.

THE POLITY AND THE SECULAR RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH,
FROM THE ACCESSION OF HILDEBRAND TO THE CONCORDAT
OF WORMS (1073-1122).

ON the 22d of April, 1073, while the Archdeacon Hildebrand was conducting the obsequies of Alexander, he was suddenly called, amid the acclamations of the clergy and people, to ascend the throne of St. Peter. He took the name of Gregory VII.

Character and
aims of Gregory VII.

Although he accepted the responsibilities of the office with apparent reluctance, he brought to the administration of it an unsurpassed vigor and sagacity. He was the representative of a new theory of Church and State, which is clearly set forth in the bull in which, for the second time, he excommunicated Henry IV. His words were: "Come now, I pray you, O most Holy Fathers and Princes (Peter and Paul), that all the world may know that if you are able to bind and loose in heaven you are able on earth to take away, or to give to each, according to his merits, empires, kingdoms, duchies, marquises, counties, and the possessions of all men." The interpretation is plain. The life of the soul is higher than that of the body. The few years men live on earth are as nothing compared with a never-ending existence in the world to come. He, therefore, who controls eternal destinies must of necessity be supreme here below. To him the mightiest prince and the meanest peasant must bow in homage and obedience. Gregory looked upon himself as raised to this eminence. He believed that to him had been committed the care of the kingdom of Christ, and that to defy his authority was to resist God. From the beginning of his pontificate he asserted claims of Rome, of one

kind or another, over most of the countries of the West. His aim, be it observed, was not to annihilate secular rule, but to subordinate it by establishing a higher jurisdiction, endowed with a divine prerogative to interpose for the correction of abuses. In the affairs of the Church he claimed absolute power. It was his right not only to depose bishops, but even to do it without a hearing. Although he was sincere in his desire to purify the Church and to free it from a corrupting dependence on the State, he was not very scrupulous in the choice of means by which he might carry out his purposes. There was a mixture of craft, of hardness, and of pride in his temper and actions. The papal anathema, as wielded by him in that ignorant and superstitious age, became a terrible weapon of injustice and oppression. His best energies were wasted in trying to create a theocracy on earth, an attractive ideal which was mischievous mainly because it was impracticable.

Gregory's first conflict was with the married clergy. At his command the papal legates stirred up the people against them and thus forced upon them an outward compliance with the Celibacy and investiture. rule of celibacy. Then came the great struggle of his reign. Simony, and, what to his mind was its chief source, the right of lay investiture, must be abolished. But the real cause of both was the wealth of the Church. As long as the possession of a rich see meant a life of ease and influence, men would not scruple to purchase ecclesiastical preferment, nor would needy princes be loth to replenish their treasuries at the expense of such aspirants for power and affluence. But if the clergy would possess domains and privileges, then why should they not, like other vassals, do homage to their princes, and submit to be invested by their suzerains with the insignia of office? Gregory, from his point of view, could not see where the real trouble lay, nor, if he had discovered the root of the evil, would he have applied the true remedy. He thought to put an end to corrupt appointments by two measures. He would depose all who had got their positions by simony. He would also deprive all monarchs of the right of investiture by ring and staff, on the ground that such an act was sacrilege, and would restore the freedom of Church elections. The property and privileges connected with each see or abbey would, in virtue of this decree, be removed from the feudal supervision of the prince, and in effect transferred to that of the pope, since the pope was supreme in ecclesiastical affairs. This would have relieved the Church of the corrupting influence of the State, by bringing anarchy into the State and secularizing the Church. The higher clergy held of the

empire cities, duchies, and smaller territorial divisions, as well as rights connected with the customs, tolls, the coinage of money, and the raising of soldiers—in fact, half of all property. And what was true of the empire was true of every Western kingdom. To allow such vast domains and prerogatives to pass beyond the control of the monarch, and to fall under the supervision of the pope, would have made an end of all efficient civil government. In their opposition to Gregory's demands and encroachments the rulers of the West were not moved by any distinct theory of rights, so much as by a thirst for absolute rule. There was an irreconcilable opposition between their ambition and the designs of the pope. Greg-

Struggle of
Gregory and
Henry IV.

ory was politic enough to select an antagonist against whom he had some chances of success. He therefore avoided a quarrel with William the Conqueror, although the papal emissaries were not allowed to use legatine power in England, nor even to land without the king's permission ; nor could bishops receive letters from Rome until after the king had examined them. Gregory had threatened Philip of France, but now he passed him by also, and chose to fight the battle with Henry IV. The reasons for this choice are apparent. Henry was king of Germany and thus needed only the papal coronation to complete his title to the empire. His education had been committed to designing prelates, and since he had never been taught to govern himself he was unfit to rule over others. The divisions which had sprung up in Germany during the long regency were increased by his licentiousness and oppression. Many of his subjects, and especially the Saxons, only waited for an opportunity to throw off their allegiance. Henry's reckless sale of Church offices justified an attack which his weakness invited, and a victory over him as the heir of the empire would be more signal than over any other ruler of the West. At the Lent synod of 1075, Gregory prohibited lay investiture, and excommunicated five of Henry's counsellors who had been guilty of simony. He wrote the king a letter urging him to avoid those under spiritual condemnation and to obey the sacred decrees. This was followed by a summons to Rome, on pain of excommunication, to answer for his crimes before an ecclesiastical tribunal to be held on February 22, 1076. These acts of the pope threw Henry into a passion. In order to anticipate the papal anathemas, he caused Gregory to be deposed by the subservient imperial prelates assembled at Worms. He then sent a letter to "Hildebrand, no longer pope, but a false monk," denying the right of the papacy to judge the king, except for apostacy, asserting that Gregory had

corruptly obtained the pontificate, and closing with the words: "Let another ascend the chair of St. Peter who will not cloak violence with religion, . . . for I, Henry, king by the grace of God, with all my bishops, say unto you, Get down! get down!"

When the first anniversary of this council at Worms came, Henry was at Canossa. The next day, barefoot and in the garb of a penitent, he stood waiting in the yard, a suppliant for admission to the castle. The haughty pope was within. It was the month of January, and yet the royal penitent was kept standing there for three days before he was admitted to receive absolution. A papal decree had wrought this change in the fortunes of the king. Deposed, anathematized, and forsaken, with his subjects absolved from their allegiance and in open revolt, he had been compelled to lay aside the regal authority until the pope should pronounce judgment at Augsburg, early in the coming year. With his wife and child and a few attendants he had crossed the Mount Cenis pass to Canossa, to seek reconciliation, and thus to avert the dreaded sentence.

But Canossa brought humiliation upon Henry and disgrace upon the empire; it did not restore to him the lost dominion. He now gathered about him his old counsellors, and strove to win by force what he had failed to gain by submission. The German

princes elected another king, Rudolph of Suabia. The pope summoned both monarchs to his tribunal, but only succeeded in earning the reproaches of Rudolph and in confirming the hatred of Henry. In 1080, however, believing Rudolph to be finally victorious, Gregory a second time excommunicated his chief antagonist. But this act proved to be premature. Rudolph was slain in battle, and Henry was soon triumphant. Gregory was compelled to see the antipope, Clement III., established in Rome, and the excommunicated king crowned emperor. Gregory's life was no longer safe in his capital, and he sought an asylum with his Norman ally, Robert Guiscard. He did not

long survive the victory of his enemies. On May 25, 1085, he died at Salerno, saying: "I have loved righteousness and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." The papal

party soon found in Urban II. a leader scarcely inferior to Gregory himself. By adroit political intrigues the imperial power in Italy was reduced, and Henry's son, Conrad, urged on to rebellion. Urban became strong enough to enter into a contest with Philip of France, and to excommunicate him for his connection with Bertrade. Conscious of his position as the right

Henry at Canossa, January 24, 1077.

Contest of Henry and Rudolph.

Death of Hildebrand.

Urban II. and the crusades.

ful leader of Christendom, he placed himself at the head of a movement which soon made him all-powerful in the West. The pilgrims to Jerusalem were maltreated by the Turks. Urban sent an enthusiast, Peter the Hermit, through North Italy and France to preach a crusade. He himself urged it by letter, and in the synods of the Church. At the close of his memorable speech at Clermont, in 1095, the whole assembly, swept away as one man by a tide of emotion, cried out, "God wills it." The religious zeal of the West was enlisted in the sacred enterprise. Christians were eager to strike down the infidel who was desecrating the sepulchre of their Lord. The pope appealed to every passion of the human heart. Those who went in penitence were to receive absolution for all sins, and to those who fell eternal blessedness was the promised reward. The institution of knighthood gained a religious consecration and gave rise to chivalry. The holy cause was hallowed, as men believed, by miracle and prophecy. Nor was this all. The moment the debtor or the criminal took the cross, he avoided the clutch of the law. In Palestine the adventurer might seek excitement and booty, the warrior hoped for territory and renown. At the head of this mighty movement stood Urban, the Roman pontiff. The power of the antipope sunk into insignificance, and he became merely the leader of a Roman faction. The death of Urban and the capture of Jerusalem by the crusaders occurred in the summer of 1099. The last days of

Death of Henry IV., 1106.

Henry IV. were embittered by the revolt of his second son, Henry, whose unnatural treason was encouraged by the blessing of Paschal II., Urban's successor. The quarrel about investitures had spread to England, where the intrepid Anselm had faced William Rufus and Henry I., in behalf of the rights of the Church. It was now settled in 1106 by a compromise much resembling the subsequent concordat of Worms. The king, in giving up a form, surrendered no real power which the Conqueror had enjoyed.

Investiture conflict in England.

Henry V., the new king of Germany, rewarded Paschal's patronage of his treason by the most despotic use of his ill-gained power.

Paschal II. and Henry V. At one time the pope was reduced to such straits that he drew up the preliminaries of a treaty, according to which the Church was to surrender all its temporal possessions and thenceforth to subsist on tithes and offerings. In return, the king was to give up the no longer significant right of investiture. To wealthy and ambitious prelates and to the Hildebrandians this proceeding seemed an act of supreme folly, whereby God was

robbed and his Church desolated. Mutual suspicions brought these negotiations to an end, but the threats of Henry soon wrung from Paschal the imperial crown and the concession of the right of investiture. This yielding of the pope was viewed with indignant scorn by the papal party, and he was driven, despite his oath, into an open war with the emperor. The struggle dragged on a few years longer. The sufferings which it had brought in its train gradually cooled the zeal of partisans. Renewed negotiations between Henry and Calixtus II. led to the Concordat of Worms, 1122. Investiture by ring and staff was given up, and in its place was substituted the touch of the monarch's sceptre. Bishops and abbots were to be chosen in the presence of the emperor, but without his interference. Thus the spiritual dignity of the Church was saved without trenching on the sovereign rights of the empire.

CHAPTER II.

THE POLITY AND SECULAR RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH FROM
THE CONCORDAT OF WORMS TO THE DEATH OF INNOCENT III.
(1122-1216).

UPON the death of Henry V., in 1125, the imperial house of Franconia became extinct, and Lothair, the Duke of Saxony, a leader of the Church party, was raised to the throne. But the seeming triumph of the papacy was short-lived.

Reopening of
the investiture
contest.

A contest between rival popes gave Lothair an opportunity to resume those rights which at his election had been conceded to the Church. He insisted that as prelates were his vassals they should not be consecrated until after they had been invested; for if he was obliged to invest anyone whom the Church chose to consecrate, the touch of the royal sceptre would become a meaningless form, and the great battle which the two Henrys had fought to maintain their feudal supremacy would have brought no gain. Lothair was not so careful to vindicate the imperial claim in another matter. At his coronation he consented to receive as a fief of the Roman see the lands which

1130.

1133.

Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, the devoted friend of Gregory VII., had bequeathed to the Church, and which had been a bone of contention between Henry V. and Paschal. The death of Lothair deprived the papacy of an emperor in a measure favorable to its pretensions, and raised to the imperial dignity a family destined to

wage with it a long war. Conrad, the Hohenstaufen, the heir, through the female line, of the Franconians, was chosen king. His enemies were the Welfs; and now the war-cries Welf and Waiblings (from Waiblingen, the birthplace of Conrad's brother) began to be heard in Germany. These names were corrupted by the Italians into Guelf and Ghibelline, and applied later to denote the papal and imperial factions.

While the empire and the papacy had been engaged in their great controversy, the Lombard cities gradually gained a turbulent self-government. The spirit which was manifested in this movement menaced the authority of both pope and emperor. Under its influence Arnold of Brescia, a pupil of Abelard, a priest and a republican, began to proclaim that the clergy must give back all property and secular dominion to the state, and return to the simplicity enjoined in the gospel, and practised by its first ministers. His words called out a sympathetic response in the hearts of the people. Nobles and prelates became alarmed. They looked about for charges of heresy that might be brought against him. But he was orthodox in doctrine, and in life was an ascetic. So much St. Bernard bitterly acknowledges in the words, "he neither eats nor drinks, but with the devil hungers and thirsts after the blood of souls." Condemned by the Lateran Council, and driven from one country to another, Arnold suddenly appeared in Rome itself, where, in 1143, the secular power of the pope had been for a time destroyed and a republic had been proclaimed. Although the Romans at first made overtures to Conrad, they soon began to dream of the glories of the ancient republic. Their devotion to Arnold and to his ideas was unbounded. In the contest with them one pope was slain. Another was obliged to seek protection of France and of the all-powerful Abbot of Clairvaux.

In the meantime, the fall of Edessa had revealed the danger which threatened the Holy Sepulchre. The fiery eloquence of Bernard sent the kings of France and Germany on a new crusade. The disasters which befell this expedition sorely tested the faith of the pious; but they consoled themselves with the thought of the multitudes who, by laying down their lives in it, secured an immediate entrance into paradise.

The end of the Roman republic was rapidly drawing near. Hadrian IV. (1154-1159), once the simple English monk, Nicholas Breakspeare, but now one of the most uncompromising of pontiffs,

(Guelfs and
Ghibellines.

Arnold of
Brescia,
c. 1100-1155.

1139.

Lucius II.,
d. 1145.

Eugene III.
goes to
France, 1146.

The second
crusade, 1147.

laid the rebellious city of Rome under the interdict. The Romans prized their religious ceremonies more than their liberties. Arnold was banished. The pope had scarcely become master of his capital when he was obliged to confront once more the old question of the empire and the papacy. Frederick I., whom the Italians called Barbarossa, or the Red-beard, had ascended the German throne, and was marching to Italy to quell the mutinous Lombards, and to receive the imperial crown. The jealousy with which Milan and other cities of the North watched any encroachments upon their highly valued and much-abused liberties was to prove for the papacy a means of defence against the might of the Hohenstaufens. But at this time they prudently avoided a conflict with Frederick, who was in the vigor of early manhood, and had not only astonished the world by his valiant deeds, but was supported by the devotion of united Germany. He felt himself to be the successor of Augustus and Charlemagne. All his great abilities were exerted in building up his supremacy throughout the empire.

The notions of Arnold and of his disciples were as distasteful to him as to the pope, but in sacrificing this apostle of republicanism, and in scorning the overtures of the Romans, he relieved the papacy for a time of some of its most dangerous enemies. Hadrian

now crowned Frederick. The peace between these rival potentates could only be of short duration. When the pope sanctioned by the grant of investiture the conquests of William of Sicily, the emperor took revenge for this

alleged invasion of his rights by cutting off all communication between Germany and the needy treasury of St. Peter. This act of Frederick called forth a letter of remonstrance from Hadrian, which, to the nobles assembled at Besançon in 1157, seemed to claim feudal superiority. Their rage knew no bounds when a legate, Roland, afterwards Alexander III., exclaimed : " From whom, then, does he hold the empire, if not from the lord pope ? " It was with difficulty that the emperor saved the daring prelate from being slain on the spot. The German bishops supported Frederick in his attitude towards the Roman see. In his name they asserted that he owed the imperial crown to divine favor alone. Hadrian was obliged to explain away the offensive words. The emperor's triumph over the Lombard cities, his famous parliament in the

1158. Roncalian fields, where the masters of the Roman law, the study of which had been revived in the North of Italy, claimed for him all the powers which had belonged to the Cæ-

Frederick Bar-
barossa in
Italy, 1154.

Coronation of
Frederick,
1155 ; his
contest with
Hadrian.

sars of old Rome, and his resumption of lands which had fallen under the control of the Church, again provoked the opposition of the pope. A bitter controversy ensued. The pontiff made a secret treaty with Milan and her allies ; the emperor received and listened to overtures from the Roman republic. The death of Hadrian saved Frederick from excommunication and opened the way for a papal schism. Victor IV. was elected by those who dreaded the

wrath or coveted the favor of the emperor ; Alexander III. was chosen by the party which believed in the Sicilian alliance and who were for vindicating the highest pretensions of the papacy. Political influences and not priestly anathemas were to decide who was the lawful successor of St. Peter. Alexander was soon acknowledged in all the larger countries of the West, except the empire, and in those Lombard cities which were struggling against Frederick's authority. But the year 1162 saw the destruction of Milan and the apparent triumph of the emperor and his pope in Italy. But this advantage was not lasting. Two years later Victor died, and Paschal, the new antipope, failed to win even the little homage his predecessor had enjoyed.

The attention of the world became absorbed by another struggle in which the same issue was involved, and whose result raised Alexander still higher in the estimation of Europe. In 1162, one

Henry II.
and Thomas
à Becket.

of his stanchest supporters, Henry II., of England, had caused the chancellor, Thomas à Becket, to be appointed to the see of Canterbury. The archbishop, formerly the

most trusted adviser of the king, as an ecclesiastic withstood every measure of reform that touched the interests of the Church. The

estates of the realm adopted the Constitutions of Clarendon, which aimed to restore to the monarch the authority

in ecclesiastical matters which Henry I. had possessed, and especially to bring criminal clergy under the jurisdiction of the ordinary courts. Becket was persuaded by his brother prelates to accept these reforms, but he soon after repented and sought the forgiveness of the pope. Thus the quarrel began. Becket fled to France. Alexander had a difficult position to hold. He could not afford to sacrifice the friendship of the king whose money kept alive the contest with the emperor in Italy, nor did he dare to give away the cause of the archbishop. The news of Henry's negotiations with Frederick filled his mind with foreboding, which only the enthusiasm of the Romans at his return to the capital, and a close alliance with the anti-imperialist cities in Lombardy could allay. But the time had not yet come for supporting the exiled prelate. Frederick

ick began to collect a mighty army for the invasion of Italy. Alexander hastily disavowed all Becket's acts. The emperor

1167. came, enjoyed a brief triumph, and then saw his nobles and bishops smitten by a deadly pestilence, his army melt away like Sennacherib's host, and his enemies united in the great Lombard league. The pope's cause was strengthened by this rebellion of the cities. Now he did not so much need the help of England, and he began boldly to support Becket. The king and his prelate were apparently reconciled. But the restored archbishop did not forsake his former violent courses. The king, in a fit of anger, cried out: "Have I no one who will relieve me from the insults of this turbulent priest?" Before he could recall these fatal words four

December 29, knights hastened to Canterbury, broke into the cathedral,
1170. and murdered Becket as he stood near the steps leading to the high altar. The king, troubled by the sacrilegious crime of his nobles, sought absolution from the pope, even at the price of the Constitutions of Clarendon.

Hardly had this conflict ended when Frederick advanced into Italy to break the power of the Lombards. But in 1176, after a two-

Frederick years' struggle, he was beaten at the battle of Legnano. He bore his misfortunes with dignity, recognized Alexander
yields to Alexander as pope, and concluded a truce with the Lombards.
III., 1177.

The scene at Venice, when Frederick fell at the feet of Alexander and was raised up by him to receive the kiss of peace, was hardly less striking than the meeting of Henry IV. and Hildebrand one hundred years before at Canossa. Its real significance as betokening the strength of the papacy was far greater.

A double papal election had been one of the most remarkable features of the conflict now brought to a peaceful conclusion. Another schism might prove disastrous to the papacy. To avoid such a calamity, a decree was passed which provided that the votes of two-thirds of the cardinals should be sufficient to elect a candidate for the papal office.

A few years passed away and it seemed as if the empire and the papacy were on the verge of another struggle. Frederick's power had become supreme. The Lombard cities were luke-
Death of warm in the support of the pope. But suddenly news
Frederick. came that Jerusalem, in 1187, had fallen into the hands of Saladin. Frederick hastened to the East, with Philip of France and Richard of England. The great adversary of papal absolutism

1190. was accidentally drowned in a small river in Pisidia. The crusade proved a failure. The succeeding years were a time of

humiliation for the papacy. The Emperor Henry VI. had much of his father's vigor and little of his magnanimity. He sought to make the empire all-powerful, and against him the anathemas of the aged pontiff were of no avail. But his death left the empire divided between the claims of rival aspirants and of his infant son, and the papal throne about to be occupied by, perhaps, the greatest in the long line of the popes, Innocent III.

Innocent was in the full vigor of manhood. His mind was filled with the most exalted ideas of papal prerogative. He believed that Innocent III., 1198-1216. Christ had given to the successors of Peter authority not only over the Church, but over the world. The crowns of kings and the destinies of nations were lodged by a divine decree in their hands. They were set to pluck up and to destroy, to build and to plant. Before their tribunals princes and states were commanded to bring their controversies for judgment. He who refused to hearken was to be cut off from the communion of the faithful. The theories which the masters of Roman law opposed to these pretensions had little currency except where they were reinforced by the arms of a Barbarossa. Ever since the time of Gregory VII., men had been familiar with these unbounded claims of Rome, and had gradually come to believe them. They had listened to the tale of Frederick's submission at Venice, and of Henry's humiliation at Canossa. The transient victories which the emperors had gained over the popes had seemed to most of the world like violence done to God's righteous servants. One antipope after another had fallen before the spiritual majesty of the true successors of St. Peter. The crusades had thrown into their hands vast and indefinite prerogatives, which they used to beat down their enemies, who were likewise considered to be God's enemies, whether they were infidel Turks or baptized emperors. And now, at the accession of Innocent, the affairs of states were in such confusion that he was able to carry out more completely than any one who went before or came after him the cherished theory of a papal theocracy.

Henry VI., by his marriage with Constantia, daughter of Roger, King of Sicily, had been able to secure the union of Sicily and the Innocent III. builds up his power in Italy. states in the South of Italy to the empire. It was Innocent's first concern to break up this union, in order that the papal domains might not be surrounded by the territories of the emperor. The times were propitious. In the empire, Henry's brother, Philip, and Otho, the Saxon duke, were contending with one another for the crown. The claims of the young child, Frederick, were passed over. Constantia's anxiety to ob-

tain for him the Sicilian kingdom enabled the pope, in 1198, to reduce it to the rank of a fief of the Roman see under the rule of an independent monarch. Emboldened by the freedom of Italy from imperial restraint, he drove out the Tuscan nobles from the territories of the Church, and established his authority in the city of Rome itself. He formed the Tuscan league, which became much more devoted to the interests of the papacy than the Lombard league had

Interference of Innocent in Germany.
 been. The conflict which was going on in Germany furnished an inviting occasion for papal interference. Despite the protests of Philip's party, Innocent employed, in 1201, all his spiritual authority and worldly power in assisting the cause of Otho, who was a Guelf and who had promised to satisfy the claims of the papacy. But no sooner was Otho

1209.
 crowned than he began to assert his imperial prerogatives. The pope did not hesitate to plunge the empire again into civil war. Young Frederick's claims were now revived. The Lombard cities changed sides. The Guelfs fought for the emperor because he was a Guelf; the Ghibellines fought against him for the same reason, even though it brought them into the company of the pope and his Tuscan allies. Frederick was victorious, and at the Diet of Frankfort, in the year 1212, he was chosen emperor.

Innocent's interference was not confined to the empire. He obliged Philip Augustus of France to put away his beloved Agnes of Méran, and to acknowledge as his wife the hated Ingeburga, from whom the French prelates had granted him a divorce. Of course weaker monarchs could not look for milder treatment. In 1208, John of England, who refused to recognize as Archbishop of Canterbury Cardinal Stephen Langton, who had been appointed by Innocent, was deposed, and his kingdom handed over to France. Alarmed at the strength of his

Innocent III. and Philip Augustus.
 1213.
 enemies he submitted abjectly, and received back his kingdom as a fief of the Roman see. But when the pope hurled his anathemas at the barons of England because they would not give up the Great Charter which they had wrested from their humiliated monarch, his words aroused indignation, and his interdict was treated by them with contempt.

Another prosperous people did not hesitate to subordinate their reverence for the pope to the interest of their state. The Venetians, in 1202, skilfully turned aside the crusading army, which it had been the great aim of Innocent's reign to collect, to the conquest of Zara, a town which had been taken from them by the King of Hungary. The soldiers of the cross, despite the

Innocent III.
 and Venice.

threats of the indignant pope, not only advanced to the capture of a Christian city, but in the cause of the deposed emperor of the East sailed to Constantinople, and restored Isaac Angelus to his

lost throne. Discontented with his treatment of them,
1204.

they stormed the city, and set up an emperor of their own. Innocent condemned the diversion of the crusade from its holy object, but consoled himself by subjecting the Patriarch of Constantinople to Rome, and thus taking what he regarded as the

first step towards healing the schism. In another crusade
The Albigensian crusade.

Innocent was more successful, but his success has left upon him and upon those whom he employed, an indelible stain. Certain sects arose in the South of France, which, with a zeal for purity of life and an opposition to the claims of the priesthood, as well as to ecclesiastical abuses in general, combined peculiar doctrinal beliefs which were somewhat akin to the dualistic ideas prevalent in the East. They were called Catharists, and, because they were numerous in and near the city of Albi, were named Albigenses. Their tenets threatened the very foundations of the hierarchical system. Persecution was found of no avail. All Languedoc was filled with heresy. The violence of the papal legate, Peter

of Castelnau, was avenged by his murder. Innocent at
1208.

once proclaimed a crusade, offering the sunny lands of the South, and heaven hereafter, to all who would engage in the holy war. The crusaders, led by Arnold, Abbot of Cîteaux, and Simon de Montfort, fulfilled their commission with inhuman cruelty. Their thirst for blood and their unbounded rapacity continued to rage in spite of the feeble attempts of the pope to check them. Heresy, however, was not uprooted by all this brutality. Inquisito-

rial powers, had been given to the papal legates. Bish-
The Inquisition.

ops were especially charged by the Fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, through themselves, or by agents appointed by them for the purpose, to ferret out and punish heretics. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse organized more strictly this episcopal inquisition. In 1232 and 1233 the work was entrusted to monks of the Dominican order. They were to stand in a direct relation to the pope, since bishops and local synods could not be trusted to exercise the desired rigor. Thus arose the Inquisition, which exercised its powers with somewhat varying rules in different countries, but was one of the most terrible engines of intolerance and tyranny which human ingenuity has ever devised.

CHAPTER III.

THE POLITY AND THE POLITICAL RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH,
FROM THE DEATH OF INNOCENT III. TO THE ACCESSION OF
BONIFACE VIII. (1216-1294).

A few days before Innocent's death, which occurred on July 16, 1216, Frederick II. promised that, when he should receive the imperial crown, he would give to his son, Henry, Naples and Sicily, which were fiefs of the Roman see, and which it was the policy of the pope to keep from being again united to the empire. Innocent's successor, Honorius III. was at heart a crusader and not a statesman. He exacted from Frederick, as the price of the crown, the promise that he would lead the Christian armies to the recovery of Jerusalem, but he made only a feeble attempt to keep the emperor from establishing his authority in the Sicilian kingdom. It was not long before the papal lands were encompassed by the imperial territories, as they had been under Henry VI. Each succeeding year added to the power of the emperor. Germany was united. The prince who was to have reigned over the Two Sicilies was, in 1222, elected king of the Romans, and thus made heir of the empire. The disorders which had arisen in the Sicilian kingdom under Innocent's protectorate were repressed. In Lombardy alone imperial authority was resisted. There, in 1226, a new league was formed whose cause was openly espoused by the pope. Frederick pleaded the necessities of his vast realm as an excuse for putting off the crusade from year to year, and yet he bound himself under more and more solemn engagements to undertake the expedition. During the reign of Honorius the constitution of the two great mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, was completed. These preaching friars faithfully supported the papacy against priests and princes alike, and did for it the work of a standing army in the ensuing struggle with the last of the Hohenstaufens.

D. 1216.

F. 1223.

Frederick II.
and Gregory
IX.

The death of Honorius put an end to the peaceful relations of the papacy and the empire. Frederick could not hope for mild treatment at the hands of the next pontiff. Gregory IX. (1227-1241) possessed an inflexible will, and an energy apparently undiminished even at his advanced age. He added to a profound knowledge of the canon law a practical ex-

perience in the affairs of the papacy, acquired in the service of Innocent and Honorius. The time appointed for the emperor's departure arrived. There were new delays, and then sickness in the camp. Finally the fleet set sail, but soon the emperor returned, pleading that he was ill, and promising to go as soon as he should regain his health. But Gregory would listen to no excuses. Amid circumstances which added peculiar terror to the occasion, he pronounced the sentence of excommunication. "All the bells joined their dissonant peals; the clergy, each with his torch, stood around the altar. Gregory implored the eternal malediction of God against the emperor. The clergy dashed down their torches; there was utter darkness." The sentence of the pope was proclaimed by every zealous churchman and wandering friar in the lands of the West. The emperor might hold up to the gaze of the world the ruinous ambition and venality of the Roman court; but the words of one who was cut off from the communion of believers, one at whose approach the ministrations of religion must cease, could have but little weight against the curse launched at him by the vicar of Christ, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Yet the papal decrees did not seriously weaken Frederick's imperial authority, nor did they move him to alter his plans. He made preparations to start on the long-deferred crusade.

Fifth crusade,
1228-1229.

Gregory was horror-stricken at the thought of an excommunicated prince assuming to lead the Christian armies. Far better would it be to leave the sepulchre of the Lord in the hands of the infidel. He interdicted the payment of the taxes which had been levied for the expenses of the crusade, he forbade the emperor to go, and when his commands and his threats were alike disregarded, he sent two Franciscan friars in a fast ship to outsail the imperial fleet, and to proclaim that Frederick was under the ban of the Church, and therefore incapable of conducting the holy enterprise. But news came that in spite of the papal anathemas, the jealousy of the Knights Templars and Hospitallers, and the hatred of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, the emperor had concluded, in 1229, an advantageous peace with the Saracens, and in the church of the Holy Sepulchre had placed the royal crown upon his head. Gregory now preached a crusade against Frederick. The German princes were urged to revolt. Legates were sent throughout the West to collect money. They began those exactions under which England groaned during the larger part of this century. The papal troops attacked the emperor's territories in Southern Italy.

But since the successful termination of Frederick's expedition to Palestine, public opinion had gradually come over to his side. The extortions of the Roman emissaries and the interference of the mendicant friars made the clergy lukewarm in the contest. The emperor on his return quickly put to flight the troops which had invaded his territories. Gregory could no longer refuse to nego-

August 28,
1230.

ti-ate. The treaty of San Germano saved the dignity of the papacy and cost Frederick only a few unimportant concessions. During the years of peace which followed, the pope seemed to be absorbed in perfecting the system of canon law, asserting for it an eternal validity; while the emperor was establishing in Sicily a brilliant kingdom in which the monarch was held up as the fountain of justice. Irreconcilable as the aims of these opponents were, their measures led to no open rupture. The pope did not hesitate to set the condemnation of the Church upon the unholy ambition of Frederick's rebellious son; and yet he could not look on with unconcern when the emperor advanced at the head of a victorious army, ostensibly to suppress the heresies which infected the Guelfic cities, but really to punish them for their part in the revolt of King Henry, and to fortify the imperial authority over them more completely. At the battle of

1237.

Corte Nuova, the Lombards were routed with great loss. Gregory was alarmed. If the free cities in the North were conquered, there would be no force capable of resisting the emperor, from Sicily to the shores of the Baltic. Not only the supremacy of the papacy, but even its independence, appeared to be in jeopardy. The aged pontiff did not shrink from the unequal struggle. His maxim was that the little bark of St. Peter might be tossed on the

Renewed ex-
communication
of Frederick,
March, 1239.

waves, but could never be submerged. He again excommunicated and deposed the emperor. When Frederick accused him of protecting the Lombard heretics, and of selling justice for gold, he began his answer with a vision borrowed from the Apocalypse: "A beast has arisen out of the sea, whose mouth has opened to blaspheme the name of God." "This pestilent king," he said, "has affirmed that the world has been deceived by three impostors—Christ Jesus, Moses, and Mohammed." Frederick could also quote Scripture. He declared the pope to be that great dragon who had seduced the whole world. He defended himself from the charge of infidelity, calling upon God to judge between him and his enemy who had so basely defamed him.

Frederick possessed an acute understanding, which was quick-

ened in its activity by an indignant sense of the wrongs which were done him in the name of religion. His mind was broadened by familiar intercourse with cultivated Saracens who frequented his Sicilian court. It is, however, improbable that he uttered the remark about the three impostors. He was not the first nor the last one to whom this offensive saying was attributed. He may have had little faith in sacerdotal religion. It is certain that he caught no glimpses of the truths of the gospel that deeply affected his moral conduct. It was not his own words or virtues which saved him from being overwhelmed as an outcast. Matthew of Paris wrote: "Had it not been for the avarice of Rome, which destroyed the devotion of the people for the lord pope, the whole world would have risen up against the emperor as the enemy of the Church and of Christ." The attempts of Gregory to raise up a pretender to the throne were met with scorn. Eberhard, Archbishop of Salzburg, cried out: "Unless we are blind, we behold under the title of Pontifex Maximus, under the cloak of a shepherd, a most ravenous wolf." The pope called a council, but the

1241

bishops and abbots who obeyed the summons were captured by the emperor's fleet and kept in prison in Naples. Already Frederick's troops were beneath the walls of Rome. Death interposed to save Gregory from further humiliation. He expired on August 21, 1241.

There was a long delay before the election of his successor, and then came fruitless negotiations between Innocent IV. and Frederick. Innocent fled to Lyons. The kings of England, France, and Aragon would not receive so costly a guest.

Innocent IV.
(1243-1254)
and Frederick.

In his anger the pope exclaimed: "After the dragon is trodden under foot, quickly the little serpents will be crushed." He called together a general council at Lyons in 1245. Thaddeus of Suessa appeared before it to defend the emperor. His words could have no effect on the mind of a pontiff blinded by animosity and intoxicated with a sense of his power. Innocent did not deign to submit the question to the votes of the assembled prelates. He pronounced the sentence of excommunication and deposition upon Frederick. At the news of this act the emperor gathered his energies for a mortal struggle. He did not, as before, separate the cause of the pope from that of the other clergy. He struck a blow at the whole hierarchical system. He declared it to be his purpose to bring back the priesthood to the position they occupied in the early Church, that they might, with proper humility, live after the manner of the apostles. In the eyes of the

world Frederick thus convicted himself of a most dangerous heresy, and he alienated many who had hitherto believed in him. He had made the fatal mistake of being in advance of his age—a position impossible to sustain, even if his personal character had commanded the respect of religious men. Innocent now declared eternal war against him and against his family. The revenues of the churches of England and France were exhausted to pay the expenses of the crusade and to buy adherents for rival emperors. For a time all went well with Frederick. His arms were victorious over his enemies. But suddenly the shadows of the impending doom of his house seemed to settle about

him. In 1248 he suffered a terrible reverse before the rebellious city of Parma. His counsellor, Thaddeus, was captured and slain. Soon after, Enzo, his favorite son, was languishing in the dungeons of Bologna, and his friend and chancellor, Peter de Vineia, was proved to be a traitor. Frederick's mind seemed to break under his misfortunes. Another year, and the monarch who had been esteemed the "wonder of the world" was dead. His death occurred on December 13, 1250.

But Innocent was not content with this accomplishment of his hopes: he would destroy the whole viper brood. He carried on an implacable warfare with Conrad, promising all who would join in the holy cause, with their arms or their money, remission of sins. After Conrad's death, Innocent's successors strove to drive Manfred, natural son of Frederick II., out of the Sicilies. The crown had been sold by the pope to Prince Edmund of England; but now that his father, Henry III., could pay no more in the effort to seize on the prize, it was offered to Charles of Anjou, brother of Louis IX., the French king. In 1266 Charles conquered Manfred and took the kingdom. Young Conradin, the last of the Hohenstaufens, came from his ancestral home in Germany to win back his father's Sicilian realm, but fell into the hands of his relentless foes, and, on October 29, 1268, died on the scaffold.

The triumph of the papacy seemed to be complete when Rudolph of Hapsburg, in 1273, was chosen emperor. He relinquished all the imperial claims over those territories in Central and Northern Italy which the popes declared to be subject to the Roman see, and pledged himself not to disturb Charles of Anjou, the papal vassal, in the possession of the Sicilian kingdom. In Lombardy his authority was not great enough to threaten Rome, and yet it acted as a check upon the schemes of Charles to unite

Misfortunes
of Frederick.

Ruin of the
Hohenstaufens.

Condition of
the papacy.

the whole peninsula under his rule. The popes, by destroying the Hohenstaufens, had reduced the dominions of the Holy Roman empire until they were hardly more extensive than the German kingdom. They had fatally weakened on its temporal side the mediæval theory of the government of the world. This result could not fail in time to react unfavorably on their own position, especially as out of some of the fragments of the empire they had constructed a principality for themselves. They were in danger of becoming mere Italian princes, and of losing their lofty rank as the spiritual lords of the world. But this was not the whole danger. The successors of Innocent, in order to drive Frederick's heirs out of the Sicilies, had got for themselves an ally who was soon to become a master. A few of them, like Gregory X. (1271-1276), condemned Charles for the oppression by which he was exhausting Sicily. But Martin IV., a Frenchman, gave himself entirely to the furtherance of the king's wishes. In Sicily the tyranny became so intolerable that at the hour of vespers on Easter-Monday, 1282, a rising took place and all the French on the island were massacred. The power of the pope in Sicily was destroyed. Peter III., of Aragon, who had married the daughter of Manfred, became King of Sicily, and Charles of Anjou was restricted to Naples.

The Sicilian
Vespers.

In the struggles which ensued, papal authority was steadily resisted. Anathemas appeared to have lost much of their former terror, and to fall with little effect. The kings of the West began to declare war and make peace, regardless of the prayers and threats of the Roman pontiff. A partisan spirit prevailed among the cardinals. At one time (1268-1271) the papal chair was vacant for nearly three years. Gregory X., the newly elected pope, proclaimed a law by which the cardinals in conclave should be starved into unanimity unless they effected an election within a reasonable time. But this rule was more often suspended or defied than complied with. At the close of this period the cardinals, weary of their chronic wrangling, at length chose the pious hermit, Peter of Mur-

Celestine V.,
July, 1294-December, 1294.

rone, who assumed the name of Celestine V. They were soon aware of their mistake. It was difficult to say whether Celestine fell more completely under the control of the King of Naples or of the ambitious Cardinal Cajetan. The hermit pope was more at home in the solitude of the mountains, which he remembered as the place where he had enjoyed "tranquillity" and "a stainless conscience," than in the midst of the intrigues which surrounded him in his exalted station. After a reign of two years he was easily persuaded by Cajetan to lay down

his burdensome office. But not even then was he to find the rest that he coveted. The fears and jealousies of the cardinal, to whom his retirement had offered the opportunity of making himself pope, did not cease to pursue him until he died, a prisoner in the castle of Fumone, on May 19, 1296.

While these momentous events had been taking place in the West, the Latin empire at Constantinople had fallen, and the Greek Patriarch had again asserted his independence of the Roman see. In Palestine the Christians had steadily lost ground. Louis IX., the noble and pious king of France, made a vain effort to stem the tide, but his first expedition ended in his being captured and obliged to pay a heavy ransom. In 1270, he made an attack on Tunis.

There he and a large part of his army were destroyed by a pestilence. The year 1291 saw Acre, the last town held by the Christians, taken by the Egyptian Mamelukes. The crusades were at an end. The fervor of Europe had cooled. The charm of novelty which had once belonged to the expeditions to the East was gone. The popes had abused their right of proclaiming crusades to extort money or to raise troops to fight the emperors. The minds of men had become absorbed in affairs nearer home, and they were no longer willing to waste their energies in useless warfare with a distant foe.

The struggle which the popes maintained with several monarchs to free the Church from secular control was not limited to the subject of the relation of the spiritual vassal to his temporal lord. It extended itself to matters of taxation and judicial proceedings. According to a decree of Alexander III., in 1179, not only must the object of an impost receive the approval of the clergy, but their consent must be obtained before it could be levied upon them. Innocent III. was not satisfied with even this condition ; he would have the Roman pontiff consulted, since it was his business to provide for the common necessities.

Exemption from accountableness in the secular courts in both civil and criminal cases was claimed in 1096 by Urban II. But rulers were not ready to allow a vast body of men, some of the members of which were often accused of the worst crimes, to pass completely under an independent jurisdiction, and to become answerable only to those who might naturally be induced by sympathy and

Fall of the
Latin empire
in the East,
1261.

End of the
crusades.

1250.

Relations of
the clergy to
civil courts.

1215.

interest to favor their own order. It was this conviction that urged Henry II., in 1164, to those reforms which brought him into conflict with his archbishop, Thomas à Becket. A decree of Celestine III., in 1192, provided that the Church should first depose the criminal clerk; if he were incorrigible, excommunicate him; if he were still contumacious, anathematize him, and after that the state could do with him as it saw fit. The clergy, however, often sought to protect the deposed priest from the secular power. To do away with this evil, Philip Augustus of France

made a law that a clergyman guilty of a crime, and having
1319.

been deposed by the Church, should then be subject to capture by the king's officers without any interference on the part of ecclesiastical authorities. The zeal of kings to dispense an equal justice to all their subjects impressed the better-disposed prelates with the necessity of attempting to remove the scandals which loose discipline had made possible. Severe penalties were decreed, and criminal clerks were sent to episcopal prisons to weep over the sins they had committed, and to be kept from committing any more. The Church influenced the State beneficially by the condemnation not only of piracy, but even of tournaments—customs which had been fostered by feudalism and political disorgani-

Papal usurpations and extortions.

zation. The power of the bishops was circumscribed, on the one hand, by the cathedral chapters, the clergy of which were often men of noble birth who had sought their position as a means of living in ease and luxury, and on the other by the legates, who went everywhere enforcing the papal claims of supremacy. England especially was groaning under the burden of heavy taxation, and English benefices were usurped by Italian favorites of Rome. One voice had, however, been raised against the despotism of the pope. It was that of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, who prevented Innocent IV. from making a boy of twelve a canon in his diocese. But Henry III. was subservient to the demands of the papacy, and his bishops therefore could make little head against them. It was at this time, in 1269, that Louis IX., of France, is said to have issued his famous edict called the Pragmatic Sanction. It protected the freedom of Church elections and the rights of patrons from the interference of the pope, and forbade papal taxation without the consent of the monarch. The authenticity of this document, which was long esteemed the great charter of Gallican liberties, has been discredited, although it is still defended by some as genuine.

The great prelates, being vassals and possessing certain temporal

privileges and a certain jurisdiction, were often so immersed in business cares as to have little time for the performance of their spiritual functions. After the fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem they began to associate with themselves, as assistant or suffragan bishops, those who had by that event been dispossessed of their sees in the East. When these suffragans died, others were chosen in their places by the pope, and the succession of bishops in *partibus infidelium* was kept up.

CHAPTER IV.

MONASTICISM IN THIS PERIOD.

DURING this period the monastic spirit revived, was active enough to reform old organizations and create new ones, and then succumbed to the seductions of worldliness and luxury which had corrupted it so many times before. Some strove to subject themselves to a sterner asceticism. Others sought to care for the sick and to redeem the captives who had fallen into the hands of the infidel. Among them were the Carthusians, Carmelites, Premonstrants, the order of St. Anthony, and the Brethren of the Hospital. The older Benedictine monasteries, and especially that at Clugny, had enjoyed the favor of the popes and had become wealthy and ambitious. The discipline required by the monastic rule was relaxed. Just at the close of the eleventh century a small party of monks, zealous for a stricter form of the ascetic life, laid the foundations of the monastery of Citeaux (Cistercium).

For a time the Cistercians did not prosper, but in the year 1113 there appeared before the monastery, with thirty companions, a young man by whose influence the order was to become great in numbers and power. It was Bernard, who was born near Dijon, of a noble family in which knightly bravery was tempered with justice and kindness to the poor. Among those whom his fervent enthusiasm and wonderful personal influence had won from secular life were his four brothers. "The effect of his preaching was, that mothers hid their sons, wives their husbands, companions their friends, lest they should be led away captive by that persuasive eloquence." The prosperity of Citeaux was now assured; colonies of monks were sent out to found other monasteries, and soon the abbot Stephen was at the

St. Bernard
(1091-1153)
and the Cistercians.

head of a great organization which had representatives in all parts of the world. The Charter of Charity, as the fundamental law of the Cistercians was called, provided for the proper subordination of all abbots to the Abbot of Cîteaux, for the strict supervision of his acts by a select number of them, and for the assembling of all, from time to time, at Cîteaux, to deliberate on the affairs of the order. In 1115 Bernard went out at the head of one of the earliest colonies. In a wild, secluded valley he founded the monastery of Clairvaux. His discipline was rigorous. The silence of the valley was broken only by the chanting of the monks and the sounds of their labor. "To judge from their outward appearance, their tools, their bad and disordered clothes," wrote Peter de Roya, "they appear a race of fools without speech or sense." And yet so great was the power of Bernard and the attraction of the life at Clairvaux that, when Henry, son of Louis VI., visited the monastery, soon after arriving he declared his intention to become a monk. Andrew of Paris, enraged at his folly, left Clairvaux with curses on his lips; but before dawn the next day he hastened back, repentant, and anxious to follow his master's example.

Bernard's dominion over the minds of men was so complete that he could perform wonders which to his eyes and those of his followers seemed miraculous. He prayed with the sick, and they were healed. At his burning words of rebuke an excommunicated count fell senseless to the ground. Clairvaux soon became mightier than Rome itself. Bernard was the great leader of the Church in the West. It was he who put down heresies and healed the schism in the papacy. It was he who sent the warriors of France and Germany on the second crusade. But his greatness did not ruin him: his modesty and humility remained the same.

Thus far it had been the aim of monastic piety to withdraw from the world and to surround itself with such conditions as would be favorable to the highest development of its peculiar form of devotion. The contrast which it presented to the violence and sensuality of the age was often indirectly beneficial, but the time had come when a more active benevolence was needed. The wants of the people must be met, not merely by an elaborate ritual, but by careful instruction and earnest preaching. Neglected by a worldly-minded and ignorant clergy, they were gladly listening to the Albigensian preachers and to the Poor Men of Lyons, as the followers of Peter Waldo were called. The Waldenses were not, like the Albigensians, tainted with Manichean doctrine, but were particularly noted for

The mendicant orders: the Dominicans.

Waldo, c. 1170.

their attachment to the Scriptures. Both sects were zealous for purity of life and opposed to clerical usurpation and profligacy.

Dominic,
1170-1221.
1205.

Into the midst of the ferment caused by the Albigensians in Southern France, came a Spaniard, Bishop of Osmá, and with him one Dominic, a canon of his chapter, whose monkish severity was mingled with sympathy for the poor. These earnest men met the papal legates, Arnold of Cîteaux, Raoul, and Peter of Castelnau, whose episcopal pomp had failed to overawe the rising heresy. Dominic bade them not hope to succeed by such display, but to take knowledge of the heretical leaders and labor unselfishly for the instruction of the people. He now conceived the idea of uniting others with himself in a society for the suppression of heresy. They were to take the monastic vows and yet were not to dwell in ascetic seclusion, but were to go everywhere preaching and teaching the doctrine of the Church. His plan was coun-

1216.

tenanced by Innocent III., and the order was formally constituted by Honorius. Four years later Dominic's friars had already established themselves in Italy, Spain, Provence, France, Germany, and Poland. They braved hardship and shared the privations of the poor. Their self-denial won for them popularity and influence. They upheld an uncompromising orthodoxy, and zealously promoted the papal power. Gradually they forced their way into the universities of Bologna, Paris, and Oxford. Eminent schoolmen, Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, were members of the order.

In 1233 Gregory IX. committed to the Dominicans the task of rooting out heresy in France. Then, as we have already learned, the powers which had previously belonged to the bishops were transferred to them, and thus the Inquisition took form as a distinct tribunal.

Side by side with the Dominicans there grew up another order, the Franciscans, who owed their existence to Francis of Assisi.

The Francis-
cans: St.
Francis,
1182-1226.

The son of a rich merchant, he was a light-hearted youth, and the head of a club of gay companions. An experience of severe illness brought with it a great transformation of character. He devoted himself to the care of the sick, choosing those whose diseases were especially repulsive. Directed, as he supposed, by a voice from heaven, he set to work to repair a decayed church in Assisi. Then he became a preacher, and drew about him a band of devoted followers, who were in full sympathy with him. These he sent out, two by two, as helpers in his work of preaching repentance. He wore a coarse, gray tunic, and literally followed the command to provide neither scrip for his journey,

neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves. To reproduce the life of him who had not where to lay his head was the most ardent wish of his heart. Nothing but the coarsest fare, and the meanest lodgings, with a log for a pillow, would content him. He wept daily, so that his eyesight was nearly destroyed. In all this there was no insincerity. His disposition was most kind and gentle. Even the lower animals were drawn to him, and the stories of the attention given to his discourses by the birds and the fishes, were spun out of the familiar fact of his remarkable sympathy with the brute creation. In 1209 he obtained the sanction of Innocent III. for the founding of an order. Francis gave his followers the name "Fratres Minores," to denote the humility which belonged to them. The monastic vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience were to be most rigidly enforced, but the friars were not to shun the world: they were to conquer it. He commanded them to preach the cross of Christ, avoiding ceremonious pomp, and the display of learning. He sent his disciples to different countries, and travelled himself as far as Egypt, where he preached to the Sultan. As early as 1219, not less than five thousand members assembled at a general meeting of the order. The Franciscans caught the mystic enthusiasm of their leader, in whom they saw the life of Jesus again brought near to men. Their devout eyes beheld upon his hands and his feet the marks of the nails, and in his side the print of the spear. The *stigmata* of St. Francis, it was related, were inflicted upon him by the Lord himself, in a vision. There is no room for the suspicion of deceit. The idea of a strange physical effect of an abnormal mental state is more plausible. As time went on, the members of the order showed themselves more ready to worship the founder than to obey his precepts. They became both learned and wealthy. If the Dominicans were proud of such names as Albert and Thomas, the Franciscans could boast of Bonaventura, Duns Scotus, and William of Occam. Like the Dominicans they became possessed of rich churches and monasteries. The wealth and popularity of both mendicant orders helped to excite against them the hatred of the secular clergy. Connected with the Dominicans and Franciscans were female orders under a similar rule. The order of St. Clara, or the Clarisses, was established under the direction of St. Francis himself, by a young woman of Assisi, who belonged to a distinguished family, but left her home to lead a life of asceticism and charity. Connected with the mendicant orders there were likewise societies of laymen called Tertiaries, who consecrated themselves to lives of devotion without taking the monastic vows.

A controversy arose among the Franciscans about their right to hold property. The party which believed in the rigid observance of the rule of poverty finally separated from the rest. The seceders were called Spirituals. In their zealous rebukes of ecclesiastical corruption they did not spare the Roman Church. Early in the next century, they, especially the Fratricelli, the lay brethren amongst them, were delivered over to the Inquisition.

At the end of the twelfth century there were formed, in the Netherlands, societies of praying women, calling themselves Béguines, and afterward similar societies of men, called Beghards. Many of them, to secure protection, connected themselves with the Tertiaries. Many, following the rule of poverty, became mendicants along the Rhine, and, adopting heretical opinions, made the names of Béguine and Beghard, elsewhere than in the Netherlands, synonymous with heretic.

The Church gave its sanction to chivalry, another great institution of the middle ages. The germs of knightly service are to be found in the customs of the Teutons, as described by Chivalry.

Tacitus. At the time of Charlemagne it reached the first stage of its development and was connected with the feudal holding of land. Later, the younger sons of noblemen began to attach themselves to rich and powerful lords, and sought from them the dignity of knighthood as a reward of valor. Chivalry became a distinct form of military service. This separation was confirmed by the crusades. Since vassals were not required by feudal law to attend their suzerains to Palestine, the nobles were obliged to fill their retinues with knights, bound to them by no other tie than that of "commendation." In the crusades chivalry reached its full development. The duty of waging war with the infidel, and of fighting for the recovery of the Holy Land, gave it a religious significance. The investiture of the knight was hardly less solemn than that of the priest. With this religious element was combined loyalty, including fidelity to all pledges; gallantry, inspiring devotion to the ladies; courage, that delighted in daring exploits; and courtesy, evinced even to a foe. The ideal of chivalry was *honor* rather than benevolence. It had a refining influence on manners, but was attended with much cruelty and profligacy. It belonged to a martial age, and tended to promote conflict and bloodshed. After the conquest of Jerusalem there grew up in the Holy Land two great orders of ecclesiastical warriors. That of the Templars, so called because they dwelt near the site of the Temple, was founded in 1119, by nine French knights.

The military
orders.

A similar order, that of the Hospitallers, grew out of the society of the Brethren of the Hospital of St. John, who, since 1099, had cared for the sick at Jerusalem. The Templars and Hospitallers bound themselves by monastic vows, but manifested their holy zeal not in the convent but on the battle-field. They were looked upon as a permanent crusading army, and were given important privileges and exemptions. They grew in numbers, wealth, and power. They became independent bodies, able to set at defiance the authority of princes and prelates. Their aim ceased to be the maintenance of the cause of Christendom against the Saracens, and centred in their own aggrandisement. The fall of the kingdom of Jerusalem did not ruin them, for they had vast possessions in the West. The Hospitallers took up their residence in Rhodes, where they opposed the further advance of the Saracens. The Templars first settled in Cyprus, and afterward removed to France.

CHAPTER V.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

IN this period belong the distinct rise and full development of the scholastic theology, the characteristic type of theological and philosophical thought in the middle ages. The term "scholastic," or "schoolman," was the title given to teachers in the schools founded by Charlemagne. It came to be applied to the doctors who taught logic, and mingled philosophy in the discussion of religious questions. Taking the term in this accepted meaning, we may place the beginning of scholasticism in the middle of the eleventh century, and regard the mediæval thinkers who preceded that date as its forerunners. If we go back to the most remote source, it was Aristotle who may be said to have originated scholasticism. The tenth century was a period of barbarism in the West of Europe. That century deserves to be called a "dark" age, however unjust it may be to apply this epithet to the entire mediæval era. This condition, we have had occasion to explain, was owing chiefly to the political chaos that ensued upon the breaking up of Charlemagne's empire, and to the disuse of Latin as a spoken language, while the modern languages, formed on the basis of it, were not yet reduced to writing. In the eleventh century the circumstances were more favorable. There was renewed intercourse with the Greek empire,

What is scholasticism?

The tenth and eleventh centuries.

where the light of learning had never been extinguished. There was an influence, too, flowing from the Arabic schools in Spain, where mathematics, astronomy, and medicine were cultivated, and where Greek authors, especially Aristotle, were studied through the medium of translations. The study of Roman law and the restoration of Church discipline by means of the Hildebrandian movement, were not without a wholesome effect in promoting intellectual activity.

Beginning of
scholasti-
cism.

In 1054 Lanfranc, abbot of the cloister of Bec, in Normandy, and Berengarius, who was at the head of the school at Tours, engaged in a controversy on the Lord's Supper, in which they made use of the Aristotelian logic. This debate may stand as a landmark to define the beginning of scholasticism.

Scholasticism was an application of reason to theology, not to correct or enlarge the accepted creed, but to systematize and vindicate it. "Faith seeking for knowledge" was its motto.

The maxim
of scholasti-
cism.

The truth, it was held, is verified by the authority of the Church, and needs no other voucher. It may be the object, moreover, of an immediate spiritual experience: it shines in its own light. Philosophy is the "hand-maid" of religion. Its office, a subordinate one, is to demonstrate the reasonableness of convictions otherwise derived. Although the intellect was confined by self-imposed limits of this sort, and did not question—nay, bowed in unquestioning reverence before—the reigning Church and its dicta, the schoolmen were intensely active in reflection and debate, and they added not a little to the stock of human thought in the province to which they were devoted. Among them were men who, notwithstanding their lack of learning when compared with intellectual leaders in ancient or modern times, have never been surpassed in acuteness and dialectic skill.

The spread of the scholastic theology was largely due to the universities. Institutions of this character had existed in ancient

times. At Athens and at Alexandria, at Rome and at Constantinople, and in other cities less distinguished,

there were flourishing seats of learning, generally organized and sustained by public authority. These passed away with the decay of the ancient civilization. The schools that followed, such as they were, arose under the auspices of the Church, and were fostered by Christian princes like Charlemagne, who knew how to value learning. The most famous of the mediæval universities, properly so called, the University of Paris, grew up in the course of the twelfth century. The teachers of the new species of theology, who had begun to instruct pupils on their own responsi-

Scholasti-
cism and the
universities.

bility in the neighborhood of the cloister schools, united with one another and with these schools—that is, with the schools of the “liberal arts,” where the seven sciences were taught. Gradually chairs for medicine and for canon law were established. All these departments, being connected together under fixed regulations, formed the university, in which the students were classified by the nations from which they came. On them degrees, first that of bachelor, and then the degree of master or that of doctor, were conferred. Thus there was formed in the middle ages a guild of scholars. Oxford originated not long after. Other universities sprung up in different parts of Europe. At Salerno, as early as the beginning of the twelfth century, there was a school of medicine. At Bologna the study of Roman law was prosecuted with great zeal. Paris was the most renowned seat of theology. The University of Paris was called “the mother of universities,” from the number of these establishments which were formed on the model furnished by it. To the universities young men of inquisitive minds flocked from all the countries of Western Europe. The story that as many as thirty thousand studied at one time at Oxford is an instance of gross exaggeration. Yet there is no doubt that in the leading universities the doctors of the scholastic divinity lectured to great throngs of eager listeners. The ablest of the schoolmen belonged to one or the other of the two mendicant orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, each of which early secured a chair of theology at Paris. The orders were regarded with jealousy by the members of the university not connected with them. Stormy conflicts arose, but in the end the schoolmen, and the monastic fraternities with which they were connected, won the day.

The empire in philosophy was divided between Plato and Aristotle. The influence of Plato was principally through Augustine, and affected the contents of theology. Aristotle exerted his power through his own writings, which were held in unbounded esteem. One philosophical question was uppermost in the scholastic age. It was the question of Nominalism or Realism. Do the words which denote genera and species—as, for example, *man*—designate realities, entities; or are they nothing but the *names* of the individuals composing the class? The former of the two opinions, which, however, assumed numerous distinct types, was called Realism. It had been the doctrine, in an extreme form, of Plato; in a form more moderate, of Aristotle. The latter of the two opinions was called Nominalism. It had been held by the ancient Stoics. The subject had an im-

Plato and
Aristotle.

Nominalism
and Realism.

portant bearing on theological doctrines, such as original sin and the Trinity. It even had a close relation to the foundations of human knowledge and the reality of its objects.

The instrument of scholastic discussion was the syllogism. The ordinary method was to propound questions or propositions, to bring forward an array, first, of affirmative, and then of negative arguments, and, finally, to resolve the question in a "conclusion." After this method the most famous scholastic treatises are constructed.

The scholastic method.

The scholastic era falls naturally into three sections. Of these the middle section embraces the thirteenth century, the flourishing period of scholasticism, when the most eminent of the schoolmen lectured and wrote, when realism was in the ascendant, when not only the logic of Aristotle, but his other writings were in use, and helped to mould the scholastic doctrines. In the first section, when only the logic of the Greek philosopher was known, nominalism prevailed. In the last stage of the scholastic movement, embracing the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, nominalism regained the hold which it had lost in the middle period. It was the age of the decline and fall of scholasticism.

Divisions of the scholastic era.

Lanfranc, whose controversy with Berengar ushers in the scholastic era, was not a prolific writer. He was an Italian, of noble birth, and a jurist by profession, but in middle life he emigrated to Normandy, and set up a school at Avranches. A few years later, in 1042, he became a monk at Bec, to which his fame as a teacher drew a great number of scholars. He became prior of the cloister, and subsequently became abbot at Caen. He lent a strong support to Duke William in his plans for the conquest of England, and was constrained, in 1070, to become

Lanfranc.

Archbishop of Canterbury. Anselm, a younger man, and one of his pupils, deserves more than any other the title of "father of the schoolmen." He, too, was a Lombard, born in or near Aosta, in 1033. His mother, Ermenberga, was a model of piety and virtue, but the harshness of his father drove him when a youth from his home. He became a monk at Bec, where his countryman, Lanfranc, was prior, took his place in this office, and in 1093, with reluctance, succeeded him likewise as Archbishop of Canterbury. In his dealings with the imperious Norman kings, William Rufus and Henry I., he exhibited that mixture of mildness and meekness with immovable fidelity to conscience, which were distinguishing traits of his character. The labors and conflicts that

Anselm.

were forced on him by his station, and which obliged him to be absent for a number of years from England, did not divert his mind from the profound and devout meditations in which he took delight. In him the two elements—the speculative and logical tendency on the one hand, and the devout and contemplative on the other—are so evenly balanced and so thoroughly commingled that he fulfils the ideal of the scholastic theologian. His writings on original sin and on the Trinity are of remarkable merit; but the most celebrated of his works are the two short treatises unfolding his demonstration of the being of God, the “*Monologium*” and the “*Proslogium*,” and the little work on the atonement entitled “*Cur Deus Homo*,” “why did God become man?” Roscellin, a canon at Compiègne, applied nominalism to the conception of the Trinity in such a way that tritheism was held to be the unavoidable inference. Confuted by Anselm, he retracted his statements at the Synod of Soissons, in 1092. From that time, for a long period, the stigma of heresy was fastened on the nominalistic opinion. Through the thirteenth century, realism, commonly in the Aristotelian form—the doctrine, namely, that corresponding to the name of a species there exists a reality which inheres in each individual—continued to be dominant.

The most brilliant of the theological teachers of the twelfth century was Peter Abelard. His career was not without features of romantic interest. He was born in 1079. He was first a pupil of Roscellin, and then of William of Champeaux, who presided over the cathedral school at Paris. William was an extreme realist. Abelard disputed his master’s opinion, and eclipsed him in debate. He himself rapidly acquired fame as a teacher, especially after his establishment at Paris, about the year 1115. His lectures were heard with unbounded enthusiasm by thousands of young men. His career was interrupted by his relations to Heloise, a young girl for whom he had a passionate attachment, which she repaid with the most devoted affection. The result was an unlawful connection, followed, at his urgent request, by a secret marriage; for she was unwilling to place any bar in the way of his ecclesiastical advancement. Her uncle and some others made an attack upon him by night, and effected a brutal mutilation of his person. He retired to the monastery of St. Denis, near Paris. There he offended the less intelligent monks by denying, with characteristic boldness, that the St. Dionysius whom they revered as their patron was Dionysius the Areopagite, the Athenian convert of Paul. He now betook himself to a desert place near

Nogent, where he built himself a cabin ; but a host of pupils flocked after him, who found shelter in tents and huts erected by themselves. They built for him an oratory, a stone structure, called the Paraclete. Threatened with new troubles from the many who were hostile to his innovations in theology, he turned the Paraclete into a convent, and put it under the charge of Heloise, who had long before taken the veil. Ten years he spent in Brittany as abbot of a monastery whose rough inmates more than once attempted to destroy him. We hear of him as lecturing again in Paris, in 1136. The tone of his theological utterances had raised up against him numerous opponents, by whom he was charged with heresy. He was called to answer this charge at a council at Sens, in 1140, where St. Bernard was the chief accuser. Abelard appealed to the pope, by whom, however, the adverse decision of the council was confirmed. He was received by Peter the Venerable, Abbot of Clugny, within the walls of that monastery, where he passed the remnant of his life. He died in 1142. The bones of Abelard and Heloise, after being more than once removed, rest in a common tomb in the cemetery of Père la Chaise in Paris. Abelard had no intention to rebel against the accepted creed. But he exalts reason, and holds that faith which has not attained to a rational basis may be easily shaken. He was a restless and adventurous thinker, and thought that reverence for authority was carried to a superstitious degree. No problem was so difficult that he despaired of solving it ; no mystery, in his esteem, was too sacred to be probed. In a little work called "Yes and No" he brought into juxtaposition contradictory opinions of the Fathers on one hundred and fifty-seven points of theology. It was his purpose to stimulate inquiry by showing that there was no uniform patristic teaching to rest upon.

St. Bernard.—Bernard of Clairvaux—who led in the final successful assault upon Abelard, was a theologian of a directly opposite temper. We have already adverted to some of the particulars of his biography. It was in spite of the opposition of his relatives that he entered the monastery of Cîteaux, where he was distinguished both for the depth and sincerity of his piety, and for the austerities which accompanied it. The leader of a colony of monks, as we have seen, he built in the rugged and desolate gorge of Clairvaux a monastery which became very prosperous. His wisdom as a counsellor, and his surpassing power as a preacher, won for him an influence superior to that of any of his contemporaries. He did more than any other to estab-

lish Innocent II. on the papal throne in opposition to his rival, Anacletus I. His overpowering eloquence it was that roused the people of France and Germany to embark in the second

1146. crusade. He blended a fearless spirit with unaffected humility, meekness, and kindness. He complained that through Abelard's influence it had come to pass in France that the Trinity was almost a theme of disputation for boys in the street, and that the sacred and mysterious doctrines of the gospel, instead of being regarded with awe, were turned into a mere gymnastic for the understanding. Divine truth, he taught, must be apprehended here by faith; for a full rational insight we must wait for the future life. Meantime, more is to be learned by visions of the uplifted soul, in moments of ecstasy, than by subtle reasoning and prying curiosity. The faithfulness of St. Bernard is seen in the work—"De Consideratione"—which he addressed to Pope Eugene III., who had been one of his pupils, and whom he warned against the dangers to the papacy itself from misconduct on the part of incumbents of the office.

Gilbert, Bishop of Poitiers, was akin to Abelard in his intellectual bent. He gave offence by a peculiar theory respecting the Trinity, but his friends and supporters were so numerous that even Bernard was not able to procure a condemnation of his opinions from a great council at Rheims, in 1148.

In the school of St. Victor, near Paris, were eminent theologians who struck a middle path between the speculative daring of Abelard and the extreme conservatism of the party that stood in dread of all earnest intellectual inquiry. To this moderate school belong William of Champeaux, a friend, and, in some sense, a guide of St. Bernard, Hugo of St. Victor, the ablest representative of their number, and Richard of St. Victor, a native of Scotland, of the particulars of whose life not much is known.

To emulate the audacity of Abelard and of Gilbert was felt to be unwise and unsafe. The effect of the conflict between the dialectic and the mystical school was to inspire caution. The schoolmen were careful to steer clear of the rocks and shoals of heterodoxy. This was obvious in the course taken by the authors of books of "Sentences." The most renowned of these was Peter Lombard, who was born at Novara, in Italy, taught theology at Paris, and was made bishop there. In his manual of theology, bearing the title "Four Books of Sentences," he sets forth and expounds the doctrines of the Creed in their proper order, but everywhere fortifies his opinions by citations from the Fathers, especially from Augustine. He received the honorary title

Gilbert,
d. 1154.

Hugo,
b. c. 1097,
d. 1141.

Richard,
d. 1173.

Books of
Sentences.

of "Master of Sentences." His work was the foundation of academic lectures for centuries. Numberless commentaries were written upon it. "The Lombard" died in 1160.

Individuals there were whose devotional tendency was offended, and whose aversion to rationalism was excited, even by the Lombard and the more moderate dialecticians. One of these mystics

Joachim, c. 1145-1202. was Joachim, Abbot of Floris, a great student of apocalyptic prophecy. Their efforts to check the reigning tendency were abortive. Of more interest to us at the present day

John of Salisbury. is a character like John of Salisbury—so styled from the place of his birth in Wiltshire—who studied at Paris

and other places on the continent, was secretary of Theobald and then of Thomas à Becket, Archbishops of Canterbury, and in his closing years was Bishop of Chartres. He was a diligent and appreciative student of the Latin writers, in particular of Cicero. He represents the humanist or literary spirit, so different from the subtle inquiries and logical refinements of the schoolmen of his time. Besides other writings from his pen which are specially instructive respecting scholastic education, his letters are valuable documents for the contemporary history.

In the second section of the scholastic era, when the physics and metaphysics of Aristotle were in the hands of the schoolmen,

Homage to Aristotle. the esteem for the ancient master in philosophy was carried to the highest pitch. He was deemed to have ex-

hausted the resources of the human mind, when it is not aided by supernatural light, in the ascertainment of ethical and religious truth. Not unfrequently, the Bible and the Fathers were neglected, and passages were cited from Aristotle in support of dogmas, as if he were an infallible oracle. Yet his influence on doctrine was mainly in directions in which current opinion, independently of his teaching, strongly tended.

Alexander of Hales, who was brought up in the cloister of Hales, in Gloucestershire, and studied both at Oxford and Paris, was one

Alexander of Hales, d. 1245. of the first to draw materials from the writings of Aristotle, to which we have just referred. He was denominated the "Irrefragable Doctor" and "Fountain of Life."

He was a celebrated teacher at Paris. His "Sum of Theology," his principal work, was founded on the "Sentences" of Peter Lombard.

Bonaventura, 1221-1274. Alexander was a Franciscan, as was his famous pupil Bonaventura, who became general of the order. The latter

was a logician, yet set a higher value on spiritual illumination than on intellectual exertion as a source of religious knowledge.

"Seraphic Doctor" was the not inappropriate title attached to him by his admiring disciples.

No theologian of German birth in the middle ages was the equal of Albert the Great, teacher at Cologne and General of the Dominican Order in Germany. From the variety of his acquisitions he was called the "Universal Doctor." From his acquaintance with natural science he was suspected by the vulgar of being a sorcerer. But Albert, although justly revered, was outstripped in talents and fame by his pupil, the most profound and the most acute of all the schoolmen, the "Angelic Doctor," Thomas Aquinas. He was a native of Aquino, a town not far from Naples. His parents were persons of rank: on his mother's side he was descended from the Norman dukes of Lower Italy. A taciturn youth, he was nicknamed by his fellow-students at Cologne the *bos mutus*—"the silent ox." "This ox," said Albert, after hearing one of his exercises, "will one day fill the world with his lowing." He grew up to be the great light of the Dominican order, into which at an early age, despite the earnest resistance of his relatives, he had been drawn. He taught at Paris and Cologne, at Rome and Bologna, and spent his last years at Naples. His great work is the "Sum of Theology," which has deservedly maintained the highest reputation in the Roman Catholic Church down to the present day. Thomas began his lectures and his writings with prayer. Daily he caused a devotional work to be read to him aloud. When, in his studies, he fell into perplexity on some difficult point, he was accustomed to fall on his knees and to supplicate God for light.

Associated often with the name of Aquinas, is that of the renowned Franciscan theologian, John Duns Scotus, who taught at Oxford, Paris, and Cologne. Whether he was born in Scotland, in Ireland, or in the North of England, is uncertain. He was rightly named the "Subtle Doctor." In the nicety of his distinctions he goes beyond all the other schoolmen except William of Occam. To express these fine-spun distinctions, Scotus was obliged to invent many new Latin words, thus giving to his style a barbarous character. He lacks the spiritual depth of Aquinas, and marks the separation of the religious and the logical interest, and the ascendancy of the latter. Scotus differed from Aquinas on numerous topics. Hence there arose the two noted parties of Thomists and Scotists, whose debates continued until the end of the scholastic period. The chief point of difference was on the question of the relation of grace to the human

Albert the
Great,
1193-1280.

Thomas
Aquinas, b.
1225 or 1227,
d. 1274.

Duns Scotus,
b. 1265 or
1275, d. 1309.

will. Thomas followed for the most part Augustine ; Scotus was inclined to Semi-Pelagianism. It may be added that Thomas was an Aristotelian Realist ; Scotus was a Realist of the more extreme Platonic type.

One of the noblest as well as ablest men of the thirteenth century was Roger Bacon. At a time when the drift of studies was almost wholly in the direction of logic and metaphysical theology, and away from literature, he turned, with an unquenchable thirst for knowledge, to the languages, to mathematics, and the natural and physical sciences. He sought for copies of the Latin authors with an avidity that surmounted all obstacles. While other teachers at Oxford were disputing on the nature of genera and species, he was prosecuting with ardor researches in optics. He joined the Franciscans, but the result was that hinderances were put in the way of the publication of his writings by his less enlightened superiors. Finally a pope, Clement IV., gave him countenance, and in eighteen months he wrote three large treatises, "The Greater Work," "The Minor Work," and "The Third Work." A pope of a different character, Nicholas IV., gave the rein to his persecutors, and Bacon was long confined in prison. He understood the method of experimental science, and excelled his renowned namesake of a later age in the ability to carry out that method in practical investigation. He well understood the value of mathematical science as a key to physical knowledge. At the same time he was a proficient, for that day, in distinctively literary pursuits. He was versatile without being shallow. He deserved to wear the title of "Wonderful Doctor"—*Doctor Mirabilis*.

Another writer, whose name is less familiar than that of Roger Bacon, one who was interested, also, in scientific study, but was, at the same time, an earnest theologian, is Raymond Lull, to whose life reference has already been made. He was born on the island of Majorca. One of his principal aims was to check the progress of the Pantheistic infidelity which had come forth from the Arabian schools in Spain. He entered with unwearied zeal into the work of converting the Saracens and the heathen. To this end he caused chairs of Oriental languages to be established at Paris, Oxford, and Salamanca. He wrote a work on universal science, designed to provide an invincible method of argumentation against Mohammedans and infidels. Twice he went to Tunis and Algiers to dispute with the Arabic philosophers, and escaped in safety. On a third visit he fell a victim to a fanatical mob.

When we pass the limit of the thirteenth century we enter the

Roger Bacon,
b. 1214, d. c.
1294.

Raymond
Lull,
c. 1235-1315.

period of the decadence of scholasticism. A few noted names meet us, such as Durandus, Bradwardine, Occam; but they represent a spirit and method in theology which are passing into the stage of obsolescence. Nominalism revived and reigned anew, and its reign "was the tomb of scholasticism."

The great schoolmen of the thirteenth century were called upon to contend against a subtle and formidable Pantheism, which was due ultimately to the influence of New Platonism, reaching speculative minds through various channels. Amalric of Bena, and David of Dinanto, teachers at Paris, were of this way of thinking, and had, each of them, his band of followers. It was from the Arabic writers that Pantheism in its most fascinating shape penetrated into the Christian schools. In the Arabic philosophy, New Platonic ideas mingled with Aristotelian doctrine. Among the representatives of that philosophy, the ablest was Averroes, who died in 1198. His writings exerted a powerful influence. According to him, there is but one intelligence in all men, and this one intelligence is the expression or emanation of Deity. In this conception, personality in both God and man, and with it, of course, personal immortality, disappear. In connection with the Pantheistic mode of thought which was caught up from the school of Averroes, there were theologians who pronounced the doctrines of Christianity to be only a figurative representation of profounder or more exact truth. There were not wanting those who professed to receive by faith what they admitted and affirmed to be contradictory to reason. Against this implied, if not conscious and expressed, infidelity, Raymond Lull, Albert the Great, and Aquinas asserted with clearness and cogency the principles of theism. Spanish Jews were stimulated to the study of Aristotle and to philosophical speculation by their Arabic neighbors. They, too, exerted a strong influence, sometimes in a sceptical direction, upon scholastic thinkers. Moses Maimonides (1135-1204), the most famous of the Jewish writers of this period, in "The Guide of the Perplexed," his most important production, held fast to theism and miracles, yet handled the Judaic creed in a rationalistic tone which caused him to be assailed by orthodox Jews as a heretic. In the Cabala, that vast body of Jewish religious speculations, the influence of New Platonism, flowing from different sources, is obvious. In the philosophy of the Cabala, as in Gnosticism, emanation plays a conspicuous part, and mystic interpretation of Scripture abounds. With the Cabala, Raymond Lull acquainted himself; but its influence in the Church was not much felt until long after his time.

The learning of the schoolmen was insufficient to enable them to present effectively the historical proof of the miraculous origin of Christianity. They showed no lack of ability in ex-

Evidences of
revelation.

hibiting the moral evidence and the more abstract considerations in favor of the supernatural authorship of the gospel. Their definitions were often concise and exact. Thomas Aquinas defines a miracle to be an event transcending the order of nature as a whole; that is, an event which the forces of nature cannot of themselves produce. The priority of faith to religious science is at the basis of the scholastic philosophy of religion.

Faith and
reason.

"I believe in order that I may understand," is adopted as a ruling maxim by Anselm. "He who has not believed," he tells us, "has not experienced, and he who has not experienced will not understand." The heart anticipates the analytic work of the understanding. There is an inward certitude, founded on love to the contents of the gospel, and this love is the light of the soul. "The merit of faith," says Hugo of St. Victor, "consists in the fact that our conviction is determined by the affections, when no adequate knowledge is yet present. By faith we render ourselves worthy of knowledge, as perfect knowledge is the final reward of faith in the life eternal." As to the capacity of reason, Duns Scotus distinguishes between its power to discover truth for itself, and its power to recognize and accept truth when it is communicated. Aquinas divides religious truths into two classes: Such as are above reason, like the doctrine of the Trinity, and such as are accessible to reason, like the doctrine of the being of one God. But he teaches that even with regard to this last class of truths, there is, for various reasons, a high advantage in having them verified to us by the authority of revelation. There was generally a disposition to find a scriptural foundation for everything contained in the creed, but some of the schoolmen held to later revelations, transmitted by tradition alone. The reading of the Bible by laymen was subject to so many restraints, especially after the rise of the Waldenses, that, if not absolutely forbidden, it was regarded with grave suspicion.

Among the arguments for the existence of God the demonstrative proof proposed by Anselm deserves particular notice. It

The being of
God: An-
selm's argu-
ment.

seeks to infer the existence of Deity from what is necessarily implied in reason itself. We have the idea of a most perfect being. We cannot avoid having this idea. Now, if the object of the idea has no real existence, then there is a lack of one element of perfection, namely, existence, and our idea

is *not* that of the most perfect. The validity of this argument was not allowed by Aquinas. His objection, in substance, was what has since been often alleged, that it infers the existence of a being from the definition of a word. Generally the schoolmen dwell on the cosmological proof, which calls for a self-existent, unchangeable being to account for the world of dependent existences, and on the argument from design. Animated debates were held on the question to what extent the divine nature is comprehensible. This was one of the topics on which the Thomists and the Scotists were divided. Respecting the divine attributes, as on other subjects, definitions were contributed by the schoolmen which have gained a permanent place in theology.

The doctrine of divine providence was first elaborately handled by Thomas Aquinas. He held that the system of things which God has created could not be improved by any change within itself. In this sense it is the best possible system. Concerning the mode in which events are brought to pass, the doctrine of Aquinas, like that of Albert, is that of determinism. There are second causes, but the prime mover is God, and they act in virtue of this indwelling efficiency. The human will is held to be no exception to this rule. The will, to be sure, in the act of choosing, experiences no constraint. Its inclination is its own ; yet that very inclination is imparted by God, is the product of divine agency. Nevertheless Aquinas denies that God is the author of moral evil. He seeks to avoid the difficulty raised by his theory, through the assumption that sin is not a positive existence, but is something negative. This theory of determinism is opposed by Duns Scotus.

The moral excellence of the first man, in which lay the similitude, as distinguished from the image, of God in him, was held to be the gift of divine grace—a “superadded,” “supernatural” gift, as it was termed. By Aquinas this gift was declared to have been bestowed on man simultaneously with his creation ; by Scotus, it was made contingent on the free exercise of Adam’s will consenting to its reception. While Scotus was disposed to limit the effects of the fall to negative evils entailed on mankind—the deprivation of original righteousness, which left the natural powers of the soul intact—Aquinas taught that certain “wounds” were also inflicted on human nature itself, including the disorder of its powers, and the subjection of the will to the lower propensities. Aquinas, like Anselm, adhered to the realistic conception of a participation of the race in the sinful act of their progenitor. On this subject of original sin, and the character of

Divine providence.

The nature of man ; his fall ; original sin.

men at their birth, Abelard, without renouncing the orthodox view, brings forward difficulties and objections to the acceptance of it.

The scholastic disputes about the Trinity and the two natures of Christ form a labyrinth which we cannot here undertake to thread. On these particular topics comparatively little was added to the stock of theological thought. Such is not the character of the mediæval discussions of the doctrine of the atonement. The essay of Anselm on this subject is a production of great interest and importance in the history of theology. He seeks to explain the necessity of the incarnation. It was required, in order that an atonement might be made for sin. Sin is disobedience, and inflicts a dishonor on God which the transgressor cannot repair. Were he to become perfectly obedient, he could not render satisfaction for the past—for the offence of having robbed God of what belonged to him. He owes a debt which he cannot pay. The whole world would not suffice as a compensation; it would not balance the guilt of a single transgression. Only God *can* provide a satisfaction commensurate with the offence; yet it is man who, as being the offender, *must* provide it. Hence the need of the God-man. Christ, to be sure, owes obedience for himself, but since he is spotless, he owes not submission to death, the gift of his life. Yet this purely supererogatory gift, he, in the spirit of love and loyalty, makes to God. It more than counterbalances the direst sin; for rather than be guilty of the least injury to Christ, one would prefer to commit all other iniquities. Christ must be rewarded; yet how can he be? Having all things, Christ can be rewarded only by blessings bestowed on his kindred, the race of sinful men, to whom he is so intimately bound. On his account forgiveness is granted; and forgiveness is possible even for the sin of slaying Jesus, since it was a sin of ignorance: of his slayers it was said, "They know not what they do." The reasoning of Anselm is suggested by the features, not of the Roman, but of the old Germanic law. It is more akin to the spirit of chivalry than to the Justinian codes. He does not dwell on the extent of the Saviour's sufferings, or on his death as a substituted penalty. But this last conception is one into which his theory easily flows. It is set forth by Aquinas and other leading schoolmen. It was the form which the orthodox doctrine of the satisfaction of Christ assumed. Yet, along with this judicial conception, the older view of a deliverance from Satan still held its place in theology. Abelard alone raises objections to the idea that the dominion of Satan over men is pro-

tected by any right. He advances the "moral view" of the atonement, which makes it to consist, not in an expiatory act, but in such a manifestation of God's love and mercy, in the self-sacrifice of his son, as melts the soul in penitence and kindles love in return. Bernard agrees that Satan has no rights of his own which require satisfaction; but he is the executor of the divine justice. The school of Anselm and Aquinas looked on the vicarious work of Christ as a real and absolute equivalent for that which the transgressor owes to God and to his justice. At this point the acceptilation theory. Scotus takes another path. He does not allow an absolute objective equivalence of the payment to the debt. He holds to what is termed the theory of "acceptilation." The Saviour's work becomes an equivalent simply because God graciously wills to accept it as such, as a creditor may choose to discharge a debtor on receiving, not the precise and full debt that is owed, but something less and different, yet so valuable and welcome as to satisfy his wishes and make him content. In the case of Christ, the dignity of the sufferer and the circumstances attending his submission to death are taken into the account.

In the work of regeneration and sanctification Aquinas distinguishes between *prevenient* grace, which first acts on the will and disposes it aright, and the *coöperative* grace, which completes the inward renovation thus begun. The sinner, under the first operation of grace, is put in a condition to merit further divine help and cleansing. Yet Aquinas, like Anselm, regards the grace of the Spirit as from the beginning the sole efficacious agent in effecting the purification of the heart. This was in accordance with the Augustinian view of determinism. Scotus, on the contrary, makes room for a free consent of the will, where there might be a refusal. He holds that man, by the right use of his own natural power, can merit the grace which renews the heart. The merit is that of *congruity*—a fitness to receive gifts of mercy—as we may say of one that he is "a *deserving* object of *charity*." It is not the merit of *condignity* which carries in it a claim in justice. This belongs, in the unqualified sense, to Christ alone.

In the scholastic doctrine of justification the first element is made to be the infusion of personal righteousness. "Justify" is to make holy, and this element stands first in the order of nature. Simultaneously the forgiveness of sin is bestowed. The conception of justification was strongly affected by the theory as to the necessity and efficacy of the sacrament of bap-

Grace in
sanctifica-
tion.

Justification.

tism, and the need of satisfaction to be rendered by the Christian for sins which he might commit after receiving that rite.

The schoolmen generally inculcate the necessity of a living faith, involving a union of the soul to God and to Christ, and con-

sider this faith—distinguished as being the faith that

Faith.

worketh by love, from mere intellectual credence—the fountain of good works. They distinguish between *explicit* faith,

where the believer is intelligently conscious of its objects, and *implicit* faith, which is a readiness to believe as far and as fast as the truth is made known. Implicit faith signifies docility. They retain the distinction between the commands and the counsels of the

gospel, the counsels having reference to the monastic virtues of

poverty, chastity, and obedience. The virtues Aquinas

Virtues.

separates into two classes. The theological virtues are faith, hope, and charity. They are the distinctively Christian virtues, which presuppose the grace of the gospel. They are a certain participation in divinity, for “we are partakers of the divine nature.” They lead to a higher blessedness than can grow out of the natural powers of the soul, even when they are rightly exerted. These give rise simply to the natural virtues—the virtues of the second class—which are prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance.

There was a tendency in the scholastic theology to a doctrine of salvation by human merit. Faith was enumerated among the virtues, and the virtuousness of faith was placed in the love that enters into it. Faith was regarded as one of the virtues, side by side with others on the list. The value of meritorious works was exalted, although their merit was declared to be possible only through grace, and on account of Christ. The belief in works of supererogation prevailed. Implicit faith was often resolved into an unlimited submission of the mind to the authority of the Church. As the prerogatives of the pope were increased, the doctrine of papal infallibility began to take root, and was sanctioned by Thomas Aquinas.

The sacraments held an exalted place in the mediæval religious system. The number of them was definitely fixed at seven, viz. :

baptism, confirmation, unction of the sick, the Lord's

The sacraments.

Supper, penance, marriage, and ordination. Peter Lombard adopted this as the correct number. It was formally sanctioned by the Council of Florence in 1439. The sacraments were considered to be signs of the grace connected with them, symbols—that is, expressive signs—of that grace, and, at the same time, vehicles, conveying the grace which they image. The need of

sacraments which shall thus actually bring grace to the soul is founded by Aquinas on the fact that we are in the flesh, and are surrounded by material things, and on the fact that sin has rendered us peculiarly alive to the impressions of sense. The divine being condescends to our necessity. The sacraments meet the child of the Church at his birth, and attend him to the portals of the other world. Each of them fulfils in him a work of its own. Baptism, confirmation, and ordination it is unlawful to repeat, since they imprint on the soul an "indelible character," a certain capacity or faculty which is not lost. The sacraments produce their legitimate effect *ex opere operato*—that is, by an intrinsic efficiency. This is not dependent on the personal character of the officiating priest. If he have the intention to administer the sacrament according to its design, that alone is requisite. Nor is the effect of the sacrament dependent on the state of mind of the recipient, unless he wilfully resist its influence, or is in a state of mortal sin, although the benefit of the sacrament is increased if it be received with a pious disposition. The virtue of infant baptism belongs exclusively to the sacramental act.

Baptism brings with it regeneration and pardon. The guilt of previous sin, original and actual, is effaced; the principle of sin, the inordinate desires, are weakened, yet not fully subdued. The right to baptize belonged to priests, but lay baptism, when there was no other to be had, was valid. Confirmation imparted a power of growth in the divine life. Witnesses were required, by whom the candidate was upheld, or "sustained," in a spiritual sense. A certain affinity was established between the baptized person and the sponsors, and between the candidate for confirmation and the witnesses, so that in neither case was marriage permitted between the parties standing in these relations.

The Lord's Supper brought a continued spiritual nourishment to the communicant. In the twelfth century the custom of admitting children to participation in the Lord's Supper was abolished. The increasing veneration for the bread and the wine of the sacrament led to this act. There was a fear of dropping the bread and wine in the distribution of them. This motive probably first caused the withholding of the cup from the laity. This custom was a subject of debate in the early part of the thirteenth century, but became established. Aquinas propounded the doctrine of "concomitance," which was that the bread, although it be sacramentally the body of Christ, contains, by a natural or

real "accompanying," blood of the Saviour also. It is enough that the priest receives the cup. The Dominicans and Franciscans espoused Thomas's view. Stories of the host bleeding, for the rebuke of scepticism and on other occasions, confirmed the belief.

The doctrine defended by Lanfranc was that of transubstantiation, or the literal change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus. This was an advance upon the Augustinian view, which had prevailed in the earlier part of the middle ages. Pope Innocent III., in 1215, first gave to the doctrine of transubstantiation a general ecclesiastical sanction. In the celebration of the mass, the tinkling of the bell was the signal informing the congregation of the occurrence of the miracle. It was held that the mass is a real offering, a repetition of the sacrifice on the cross. It was believed that the mass is highly efficacious in averting evils and procuring blessings. Hence the practice of private masses, when only the officiating priest was present, grew to be common. Innocent III., in 1215, ordained that laymen must partake of the communion at least once in the year.

The schoolmen made penance to consist of contrition of heart, confession, and satisfaction—the last to be discharged by the offender

Transubstantiation.
Penance and
absolution.

himself, in accordance with the rules of the Church and the judgment of the priest. Only in this way could the eternal penalty due to mortal sin be escaped. At length the priest, instead of offering a prayer for the pardon of the contrite offender, performed the judicial function of declaring him absolved. The

Indulgences.

doctrine of indulgences, or of the authoritative remission of penances by the substitution for them of prayers, benevolent gifts, or other forms of devotion and self-sacrifice, was universally accepted. With the crusades came in plenary indulgences, the complete remission of penances, on account of some signal service to the Church, or remarkable proof of religious fidelity and zeal. Pilgrims to the great jubilees at Rome, which were appointed by the popes, were rewarded with this coveted boon. As a counterpart to the doctrine of indulgences, Alexander of Hales proposed the doctrine of a treasury of supererogatory merits of saints, which

Treasury of
merits.

may be drawn upon, through the agency of the pope, for the benefit of their more needy brethren. By this means even the pains of purgatory might be shortened. This doctrine was adopted in the Church, and was connected by Aquinas with his conception of the mystical union of Christ and his followers, in virtue of which union, benefits, without offence to reason, may be transferred from one to another.

The sacrament of extreme unction was thought to bring advantages to the sick, both physical and spiritual. In case of physical amendment, followed by a relapse, it might be repeated. It belonged to the bishop to ordain. Ordination by heretical bishops was declared by Thomas Aquinas to be valid. The unmarried state was assumed to be higher than the married. Hence the sacrament of marriage was said to have a negative virtue in laying bonds on sensual passion. It figured, moreover, the union of Christ to the Church; for the original term for "mystery," in Ephesians v. 32, was rendered "sacramentum" in the Vulgate.

The prevalent custom of invoking the saints and of asking for their intercession was sanctioned by the Church. More and more the worship of Mary formed a part of devotional services, public and private. In the twelfth century the doctrine of the Virgin's immaculate conception was broached. This view was embraced by the Franciscans, who were specially zealous in rendering honor to Mary. It was rejected by the Dominicans, and formed a standing subject of controversy down to a recent date.

The Church doctrine held to five abodes in the invisible world. Souls which leave the earth in a state of mortal sin, immediately enter hell, which was conceived of as a place of suffering in material fire. The abode of unbaptized infants—the *limbus infantum*—was a place where, according to Peter Lombard, the vision of God is denied to its inmates, but no positive punishments are inflicted. Gregory of Rimini, who adopted a harsher view, received the name of "torturer of infants"—*tortor infantum*. The abode of the pious dead of Old Testament times—the *limbus patrum*—where, prior to the advent of Jesus, the blessed vision of God was not enjoyed, was by Christ transformed to a place of rest and felicity. Purgatory, where literal fire was conceived to be the instrument of punishment, was the abode of souls guilty of no mortal sins, but burdened with imperfection which needed to be removed, and with dues of "temporal punishment," or satisfaction, for sins from the guilt of which they have been absolved. Heaven was described as the home of all souls which need no purification from sin when they die, or have passed through the cleansing flames of purgatory.

CHAPTER VI.

SOME ASPECTS OF RELIGION AND WORSHIP IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

In the foregoing chapters an opportunity has been afforded incidentally to touch upon many of the peculiarities of mediæval religion. Some general remarks on this subject will here be added. One is struck with the strong contrasts that present themselves in every province of mediæval life, and lend to it a picturesque character. By the side of the brilliant attire of the prince and of the bishop, we see the coarse frock of the monk and the rags of the peasant. In the vicinity of the mighty cathedral, whose spires rise above the tallest trees of the forest, are the mean dwelling of the mechanic and the peasant's miserable hovel. Associated with mail-clad knights, whose trade is war and whose delight is in combat, are the men whose sacred vocation forbids the use of force altogether. Through lands overspread with deeds of violence, the lonely wayfarer with the staff and badge of a pilgrim passes unarmed and in safety. In sight of castles, about whose walls fierce battles rage, are the church and the monastery, within the precincts of which quiet reigns, and all violence is branded as sacrilege. There is a like contrast when we look at the inmost spirit and temper of different classes. On the one hand there is flagrant wickedness, the very thought of which excites horror. On the other hand we meet with examples of sanctity that command, in the most enlightened days, the deepest reverence of all who value Christian excellence. The middle ages are commonly designated the "ages of faith." Doubt as to the reality of things divine was an infrequent intruder. When it came, it was repelled as a messenger of Satan. A sense of the nearness of the supernatural world, and of the beings, good and evil, that belonged to it, possessed all minds. A thin veil divided the realms unseen from the visible world, and that veil might at any moment part for the free ingress of invisible agents. Every thought on divine things, every aspiration, every fear, was bodied forth in symbols. Prayer and praise, religious ceremonies, sacred festivals and pageants, formed an atmosphere in which the entire community lived and breathed. Unhappily the idea of merit was closely attached to external observances. They were too much viewed in the light of a price paid for the mercy of heaven; for

Contrasts in
the middle
ages.

Defective
yet real
piety.

frequently they stood in no vital relation to morality. They were practised as a means of atonement for vice and cruelty, a bribe to placate an avenger—a substitute, it might be, instead of a sign and fruit, of repentance. Yet no one can read the counsels given by such men as Anselm and Bernard, to those who sought direction, without feeling how deeply the teachings of Christ had penetrated their souls. And such leaders were not wanting in the darkest ages. Even in the tenth century, writes Trench, “what grander company of Christian men and women, and these occupying the thrones of the earth, would anywhere greet us than greet us here—Otto the Great, and Brun, Archbishop of Cologne, his brother, these two, the layman and the priest, working so zealously together for the spread of Christian missions among the wild heathen races that raged and stormed around the fortress of German Christianity; while completing this royal group there is Matilda, the mother of these; and Otto’s queen, well worthy to share his toils and his throne, our English Edith, granddaughter and undegenerate scion of Alfred the Great.” In 865 Pope Nicholas I. wrote to the Bulgarians a letter which was accompanied by the present of Bibles and other books. He urged them to gentleness in the treatment of idolaters. In answer to questions which they had proposed, he told them that Christians were not, like the ancient Jews, confined to any particular place of prayer. He warned them that they ought not to rest their hopes on particular times and seasons, or look to them for help, but rather look to the living God. In emergencies, when men were called to prepare for war in defence of their country, they ought not to intermit their necessary labors, even if it was a time of fasting. To do so would be to tempt God. He inculcated a forgiving disposition, objected to the frequency of capital punishment among them, and to other inhuman practices. What he required of them was a change of the “inward man”—that they should put on Christ. In this way a pope could write in the ninth century. Exhortations equally Christian and spiritual in their tenor might be culled from the writings of bishops and holy monks in every century. This much may be said, that the Decalogue, the Lord’s Prayer, and the Apostles’ Creed were made familiar to all.

Life of conscience.

There was great activity of conscience in the middle ages.

It was the effect of the legal spirit that was infused into the popular teaching and the accepted interpretation of Christianity. This life of conscience was evident in the manifold austerities to which it gave rise. It meets us with impressive power in the poem of Dante, the great literary production of the middle

ages. In considering the religion of this period, we must remember that there occurred from time to time intellectual and spiritual revivals. Such, in different ways, were the Hildebrandian reform, the monastic reform under the auspices of St. Bernard, the rise of scholasticism, the outburst of enthusiasm in the era of the crusades, the formation of the mendicant orders. These "beneficent waves of high spiritual emotion," whatever mixture of evil belonged to them, lifted multitudes above the grovelling thoughts and pursuits to which they had been accustomed.

In the devotional system of the middle ages the celestial hierarchy of angels had an important place. Apparitions of angels were believed to be not infrequent. They were protectors against the demoniacal spirits with which the air was peopled. The "swarming, busy, indefatigable, malignant spirits" claimed the world of man as their own. They assumed grotesque and repulsive forms. Satan was figured as having horns, a tail, and the cloven foot. Connected with this ever-present superstition, the torment of the young and the old, was the belief in magic spells and the efficacy of talismans. The potent reliance of

the timid, tempted, persecuted soul was in the help and intercession of the saints. These multiplied in number as time advanced. Every church, every village, had its tutelary spirits. The miracles which they were believed to have wrought were numberless. More and more the legends of the saints were read, until in later times the romances of love and chivalry divided with them the popular regard. Those legends fill the sixty ponderous folios of the yet unfinished collection of the Bollandists. They contain valuable historical material, to be reached by sifting out the fiction, as grains of gold are separated from heaps of sand. Yet even the endless tales of miracles are interesting, small as may generally be their title to credence, since they embody in a mythical form the ideas and beliefs of those from whose minds they sprang, and of the generations who listened to them or hung with delight over their marvellous incidents. Far above all the saints in the popular veneration was the Virgin Mary. The homage paid to her had been increasing in fervor and approaching nearer to divine honors from the dawn of the mediæval period. Chivalry made her an idol of the imagination. The knight devoted himself to her service and invoked her aid in battle. A Chapel of our Lady was formed in every cathedral and in most churches of considerable magnitude. In the numerous hymns to Mary she was described in the most glowing terms of praise, and

Good and
evil spirits.

Worship of
saints and
of Mary.

was exalted to a position of almost controlling influence over the divine Son. With the growing worship of martyrs and saints, the interest in their relics increased. They were required in every new church that was to be consecrated. They were usually placed upon the altar or beneath it. They were worn upon the person. The reliquary in which were the bones of a saint or shreds of his apparel was prized above all other treasures. Of their efficacy in working miracles there was no doubt. An oath taken upon the relics of a saint was clothed with awful sanctity. Its violation was a terrible sin. It was said that over a chest which, when opened, was found to contain the most sacred relics of Normandy, Harold was decoyed by William the Norman into taking an oath which made him the next in succession to the English crown. "No wonder that with the whole Christian world deeming it holy and meritorious to believe, dangerous, impious, to doubt, there should be no end or limit to belief; that the wood of the true cross should grow into a forest; that wild fictions, the romance of the Wise Men of the East transmuted into kings, the eleven thousand virgins, should be worshipped in the rich commercial cities of the Rhine." For the disputed possession of relics there were fierce contests between rival monasteries. Relics were stolen, and a theft, if successful, incurred no reproach. The motive was deemed pious. The body of St. Benedict was carried away from Italy to France. The crusades afforded the means of gratifying the desire for relics, which became proportionately more intense. The sale of them grew to be a lucrative branch of trade. Vast sums of money, such as the wealthy now pay for the noblest products of art, were expended in the purchase of pieces of apparel or other objects believed to have once belonged to Christ or the Virgin. It was said that the house in which Mary had lived at Nazareth was, in 1291, carried by angels through the air to Tersatto in Dalmatia. In 1294 the angels took it across the Adriatic to a wood near Recanati, whence, in 1295, it was removed to the hill at Loreto, where it now stands. In each of its places of sojourn wondrous miracles are reported in connection with it. It cannot be denied that, with all the care of theologians to distinguish between the homage to be accorded to Mary and the hosts of saints, and the worship due to God alone, such homage in the minds of the people was practically a sort of polytheism. The government of the world, including the disposal of the lot of men for this life and the life to come, was relegated to a multitude of supernatural beings of finite powers, but full of sympathy with human distress and potent to relieve it.

The penitential system of the Church was not without a wholesome effect in imposing restraint upon rude natures, and in keeping alive the feelings of conscience. Yet it was prolific of abuses. It was hard to disconnect a false idea of merit from self-inflicted mortifications. Remorse and fear drove some to dangerous excesses in fasting and scourging. Others flew to the relief afforded by indulgences, and willingly submitted to a pecuniary equivalent, or to a pilgrimage to Rome or to Jerusalem. In some cases a rich noble was allowed to reduce a fast of years to a few days by compelling his dependents to share it with him. The terrors of excommunication, and the greater terrors of the anathema, which cut off the offender from intercourse with his fellow-men, were weapons liable to a terrible misuse, as was the interdict, which deprived a whole community of the means of grace.

What was the attitude of the Church in relation to the great evils that afflicted society? In general, it may be said with truth that the Church cast its influence on the side of peace. To heal strife among princes and nobles, and to prevent bloodshed, was regarded as one of the highest duties which the chiefs of the hierarchy could perform. The influence of religion in this direction was powerful. It is seen in such a character as Louis IX. of France, in connection with virtues that entitle him to the reverence in which he was held by his contemporaries, and to the eulogies which modern writers, including Voltaire, have united in bestowing upon him. When, of his own accord, he ceded to Henry III. of England Limousin and other conquests made by French kings before him, he was moved to this act, not because he judged that they did not rightfully belong to him, but for the reason, which he avowed, that he desired peace among their respective children, who were cousins-german. Yet the advocacy of peace on the part of ecclesiastics had its limitations. Against heretics and infidels it was an obligation and a merit to wage war. It was hostility to the Mohammedan beliefs, and zeal for the recovery of the holy places from the polluting tread of their heretical possessors, more than any broader motive of duty or of policy, which inflamed the crusaders. "It is not injuries done to them," said Thomas Aquinas, "but injuries done to God that the knights avenge." The former impulse would have been wrong, but not the latter. St. Bernard said that the knights could safely fight the infidels, for they were fighting for God. "They are the ministers of God to inflict his vengeance. For them to give or receive death is not a sin, but a most glorious deed ;"

“the Son of God delights to receive the blood of his enemies; he is glorified in the death of pagans.” Yet with reference to war among Christians, St. Bernard would have spoken in a righteous and humane spirit. The wars fomented by the popes in Germany during their contest with the emperors, and the iniquitous Albigensian crusade, were instigated and approved by those who, as a rule, preached peace to contending sovereigns. The sacred cause, it was judged, made an unrelenting warfare right and holy. It was thought to be a duty to exterminate the enemies of God.

Care is requisite in order to understand correctly the relation of the Church to slavery and to serfdom, into which slavery, mainly by the operation of political and economical causes, gradually passed. Augustine attributed slavery to man's fall, as he ascribed the dominion of man over man in general to the incoming of sin. Gregory the Great, and other eminent ecclesiastics, assert that the original state of man was a state of freedom, and on this ground they praise those who emancipate bondmen. Yet it would be an error to conclude that even these leaders in the Church were desirous of subverting slavery, or regarded this result as likely to occur in the pre-millennial period of the world's history. Augustine speaks of the relation of master and slave as part and parcel of family government. Gregory presented slaves to a convent, and exerted himself to recover a fugitive slave of his brother. Neither pope nor council pronounced slavery unlawful. Churches and monasteries possessed bondmen, often in great numbers. When Alcuin took charge of the Abbey of Tours, it possessed twenty thousand serfs. In case this custom was not allowed in a monastery, it was not on account of any moral wrong attributed to slavery or serfdom, but because it was considered more proper for monks to do their own work or to abjure certain practices which were lawful for the world at large. The emancipation of slaves and serfs was applauded, like any other act of beneficence. Even among the ancient Romans it was not infrequent for a master to give freedom to a slave, and it was always counted a generous deed. The mediæval Church denounced slavery only when it was the servitude of a Christian in bondage to a Jew or an infidel. This was always regarded as something grievous and deserving prevention by law, or through a ransom in cases beyond the reach of law. The Church from ancient times insisted that anxiety about one's worldly condition, even in the case of a slave, was undesirable, and that the freedom of the child of God and the heavenly inheritance were the chief good. Yet the Church promoted

Relation of
the Church
to slavery.

the cause of freedom by its proclamation of the dignity of human nature, of man as made in the image of God, and of the equality of all in his presence. "All men," wrote Pope Clement IV.,
 1266, "have the same origin ; they live under the same sky. . . . The immense distance between the Creator and the creature effaces the slight distinction between the king and the serf. . . . The distinction of birth is only an accident, a human institution. . . . God distributes the gifts of the Spirit without regard to the division of classes. In his eyes there are neither nobles nor villains." Moreover, the Church made its highest offices accessible to the poor. It gave them a practical proof of the reality of that equality of men before God which it inculcated in its teaching. At times it was unfaithful : it allowed nobles to appropriate to themselves its dignities and revenues ; but abuses of this sort called out voices of protest and efforts for reform. The Church also preached constantly the duty of forbearance and kindness toward the slave and the serf. It rebuked harshness and cruelty. In these ways, indirectly, in the middle ages, an anti-slavery influence went forth from the teachings of the clergy ; but it would be an exaggeration to say more. Serfdom disappeared not by any religious condemnation of it, but as a consequence of the growth of towns, a spirit of discontent and resistance among the peasants themselves, and other general causes.

Ordeals had been originally opposed by the Church. Then they were adopted and practised under clerical supervision, although
 Ordeals and torture. they never obtained the universal sanction of the clergy. In the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, as a substitute for the ordeal, the practice of using torture to elicit confessions from accused persons, and testimony from reluctant witnesses, came into vogue. It was the revival of an ancient and barbarous custom, first employed by the Greeks and Romans at the examination of slaves, and incorporated in the provisions of the Roman law. Torture was considered a species of ordeal, the ability to sustain suffering being held to be a test of innocence. Against its use Pope Nicholas I., in a manly and rational strain, protested in his letter to the Bulgarians (865). Pope Gregory I. agreed in the opinion that confessions extorted by torment were worthless. But in 1252 Pope Innocent IV. sanctioned torture in the detection of heresy, and it became a fearful engine of cruelty in the hands of the Inquisition.

As regards charity in the middle ages, it is clear that at no period in the past have there been larger gifts to the poor. The

spirit of Christian liberality was reinforced by the idea that almsgiving, and benefactions for religious purposes, were in a high degree meritorious. Wealth was poured more and more, *Charity.* without stint, into the lap of the Church. Christian lands were dotted with monasteries, from whose doors the poor, the sick, and the infirm of every sort, were never turned away. Hospitals, generally connected with convents, were multiplied, and were enriched by the bounties of the faithful. Another fact respecting mediæval charity is that it was very often injudicious. In the first place, there was little or no thought directed to the removal of the causes of the poverty and distress to which relief was lavishly granted. Giving was in forms adapted to promote the evil to which it applied a partial and temporary remedy. Poverty was considered the ideal condition of a Christian disciple. To renounce all property was the proof of special consecration to Christ; it was deemed an exact imitation of his original followers. To minister to the poor was so needful a grace, and so profitable to him who gave, that the existence of the poor seemed to be an indispensable blessing. The larger their number, the greater was the opportunity of serving Christ by ministering to his servants, and of thus procuring the heavenly reward. In the second place, there was a lack of order and system in the bestowal of charitable aid. There were provisions for all sorts of physical infirmity; but it was not until we approach the age of the Reformation, when cities began to take into their hands the disbursing of bounties to the poor, that there was more caution and judicious management. In this particular, guilds, in the bestowal of help to the needy, acted more wisely than the ecclesiastical bodies. These bodies were the almost exclusive almoners of charity in the middle ages. Gifts to the needy were very commonly dispensed on church festivals, on the occasion of the burial of the dead who were the donors, or on the anniversaries of their interment. It was near the doors of churches that beggars, the maimed, and the infirm asked for alms. Moreover, the prayers which were sought from the needy in return for what they received, and the lightening of the pains of purgatory for relatives or for the charitable individual himself, were no small part of the motive of benevolence. Men gave to others to benefit themselves. It is important to notice that while the schoolmen asserted the right of property, they did it on grounds of expediency, and in connection with the doctrine that in the state of nature all things are in common. Individual possession, although sanctioned by God, is really traced back to sin and imperfection

as its occasion. Avarice is made by Aquinas a greater sin than prodigality. While these circumstances qualify the admiration which the vast outflow of mediæval charity would naturally kindle, they ought not to blind the eye to what was truly Christlike in the tempers of heart out of which it sprung. It was not priests and monks, nobles and high-born dames, who alone signalized themselves by manifestations of self-denial. Many instances are on record of individuals and families in the humbler ranks of life who devoted their earnings to the help of the suffering, and personally interested themselves, with extraordinary self-sacrifice, in doing good.

The development of Christian architecture is an engaging topic. Converted to Christian uses, the ancient basilica, in order to furnish ampler space, sent out an arm on either side, thus, Church architecture. without any deliberate intention, giving to the sacred structure the form of a cross. The free use of the arch, by which additional height as well as beauty was secured, was a leading feature of the style called Romanesque. This continued in the East until the age of Justinian. Then the adoption of the lofty cupola, hung over the space at the intersection of the nave by the transept, gave its main peculiarity to the Byzantine style, which prevailed east of the Adriatic and in Southern Italy. In this type of building, the portion of the structure running from east to west was divided into parts equal in length, thus constituting what is called the Greek cross, as distinguished from the Latin style, in which the nave was unequally divided, the chancel and choir being at the eastern end. In the other portions of Europe—in Northern Italy, Germany, France, Spain, and England—the Romanesque developed itself, largely by the skilful use of arches for ornamentation as well as strength, into an almost distinct style, of which the Norman edifices—for example, the noble cathedral of Durham—are fine specimens.

On the approach of the year 1000 there was a general anxiety and alarm in Europe, from the expectation that the end of the world and the last judgment were then to occur. When this epoch passed by, and the excitement connected with it subsided, there appears to have been a new and wide-spread interest in church-

The Gothic style. building. Toward the close of the twelfth century the Gothic, or the pointed style, unfolded itself, which in the thirteenth century attained to the fulness of its majesty and beauty. In Northern France, in Great Britain, and in Germany, the stupendous Gothic temples were reared which remain as worthy

monuments of a glorious past that embodied its thoughts and aspirations in stone, and which still impress all who gaze upward to their spires, or walk beneath their arches, with indescribable sensations of humility and awe. In the erection of these sanctuaries churches lavished their treasures, and nobles offered their costly gifts; and, what is better, the people of all classes combined in a common enthusiasm of sincere devotion, everyone giving or doing what he could to carry upward the walls and towers, and to perfect with elaborate art every part of God's earthly dwelling. The cathedrals were framed and adapted for the ritual that was celebrated in the vast space which they enclosed. In the days when the voice of the priest was the voice of God, how was the heart of the worshipper awed and melted as he beheld the smoke of incense in the dim distance rising from the altar, heard "the pealing organ," and beheld the stately procession of the clergy, in their gorgeous vestments, moving up and down the "long-drawn aisles!" It was not churches alone which the blended artistic and religious impulses called into being. A multitude of abbeys, many of them so grand and spacious that their chapels were like cathedrals, often with peculiar charms of situation, arose in every part of Christendom. One side of mediæval Catholicism, its poetic and pleasing side, is depicted by Cardinal Newman. He is speaking in particular of England. "The fair form of Christianity rose up and grew and expanded like a beautiful pageant, from north to south; it was majestic, it was solemn, it was bright, it was beautiful and pleasant, it was soothing to the griefs, it was indulgent to the hopes of man; it was at once a teaching and a worship; it had a dogma, a mystery, a ritual of its own; it had a hierarchical form. A brotherhood of holy pastors, with mitre and crosier, and uplifted hand, walked forth and blessed and ruled a joyful people. The crucifix headed the procession, and simple monks were there with hearts in prayer, and sweet chants resounded, and the holy Latin tongue was heard, and boys came forth in white, swinging censers, and the fragrant cloud arose, and mass was sung, and the saints were invoked; and day after day, and in the still night, and over the woody hills and in the quiet plains, as constantly as sun, and moon and stars go forth in heaven, so regular and solemn was the stately march of blessed services on earth, high festival, and gorgeous procession, and soothing dirge, and passing bell, and the familiar evening call to prayer; till he who recollected the old pagan time would think it all unreal that he beheld and heard, and would conclude he did but see a vision, so marvellously was heaven

let down upon earth, so triumphantly were chased away the fiends of darkness to their prison below." It is a pity that so fair a picture has to be marred by the recollection that comes unbidden to the mind of the student, of so grievous an amount of ignorance and social misery, priestcraft and superstition.

A cardinal fault of religious services in the middle ages was the undue predominance of the liturgical element over the didactic.

The liturgy centred in the mass. In the lands which had belonged to the Roman Empire, Latin was understood, and attention has already been called to the fact

The liturgy
and preach-
ing.

that the languages which sprung from the mixture of Latin with vernacular tongues were slow in their formation. Moreover, missionaries to new countries retained the Latin in the liturgy from the force of sacred association. It was the bond of connection with Rome, a source and sign of unity. Thus Latin established itself as the sacred language. But we find that the best men in every age insist on the importance of preaching to the people in their own languages, in a plain and intelligible style. The illiteracy of the clergy, much greater at some periods than at others, was a prime hinderance to the carrying out of these exhortations. We have seen that Charlemagne urged on bishops the duty of preaching. Alcuin, his friend and adviser, gave an enlightened support to the emperor's efforts. He desired to have Christian knowledge diffused among the laity. Councils in the ninth century required that there should be preaching in hamlets, as well as in larger towns. The revival at the beginning of the twelfth century awakened a new and vivid interest on the subject of preaching. Guibert of Nogent, who was born in 1053, in a work on this theme, demanded of preachers that they should avoid obscurity, inculcate valuable truth, and preach from their own experience of the power and blessedness of the gospel. A Dominican general, Humbert de Romanis, pointed to the fact that Christ celebrated the mass only once, but spent his life in preaching and praying. The preachers of the mendicant orders discoursed in a plain and popular style to great audiences, frequently in the open air. In the fifteenth century, the period of the papal schism, Clemangis, one of the most influential men of the age, ascribed the evils of the times largely to the neglect of preaching, and to the study of theology from a speculative and scientific motive, instead of regarding it as a means of preparing for practical and effective work in the pulpit. It is worthy of remark that Thomas Aquinas, the deepest of mediæval theologians, preached to the people plain ser-

mons in the Italian tongue. In the preaching of the middle ages there abounded appeals to fear. The aim was to paint the torments of the lost in the most vivid colors. The sufferings of Jesus and the sorrow of the Virgin Mother were favorite themes, in the unfolding of which the preacher exerted himself to excite the emotions of his auditors.

In the hymns of the Church, the trammels of the classical metres, which had given them a stiff and artificial character, were gradually thrown off. "It was not," says Trench, "till Hymns. the classical framework of Latin verse was wholly shattered, quantity absolutely ignored and accent substituted in its stead, the latent powers of rhyme being at the same time evoked, that Christian Latin poetry attained the perfection which fills with astonishment all who are capable of judging, as they contemplate this second birth of Latin song." The grandest of all the mediæval hymns is the hymn on the Last Judgment, the "Dies Iræ" of Thomas of Celano, the friend and biographer of St. Francis, beginning ;

" That day of wrath, that dreadful day
When heaven and earth shall pass away."

a. 1306. The most pathetic of the hymns is the "Stabat Mater" of Jacobus de Benedictis, beginning :

" By the Cross, sad vigil keeping,
Stood the mournful mother weeping."

a. 1192. Adam of St. Victor wrote the hymn :

" Be the Cross our theme and story ;

and Bernard of Morlas, a pious monk of Clugny, is the author of "The Celestial Country," which begins,

" The world is very evil,
The times are waxing late ;
Be sober and keep vigil,
The Judge is at the gate."

a. 1031. Robert, King of France, is thought to have written the "Veni, Sancte Spiritus,"

" O Holy Ghost ! Thou fire divine !
From highest heaven on us down shine ;"

while to St. Bernard of Clairvaux we owe the hymn,

" Hail, thou Head, so bruised and wounded."

"As a whole," writes Milman, himself a poet as well as historian, "the hymnology of the Latin Church has a singularly solemn and majestic tone. Much of it, no doubt, like the lyric verse of the Greeks, was twin-born with the music; it is inseparably wedded with the music; its cadence is musical rather than metrical. It suggests, as it were, the grave full tones of the chant, the glorious burst, the tender fall, the mysterious dying away of the organ. It must be heard, not read."

From the ritual, and the hymns, an essential part of it, were developed the religious plays, the germs of the modern drama. The ritual itself, with its series of ceremonial acts, its variety of persons taking part in it in their different costumes, and its antiphonal music, had a dramatic character. The ancient drama had perished under the condemnation of the Church, and had become so demoralized as to deserve its fate. It is doubtful whether there was a time when strolling mimes ceased to furnish diversion to the people. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the religious plays, variously called "mysteries," miracle-plays, and moralities, came into vogue. The mysteries were more properly scenic representations of passages in the life of Jesus, especially of his trial and death, while the miracles drew their materials from the tales of the saints. The characters in the moralities, which were later, were allegorical figures standing for the virtues and vices, and for other abstractions. The mysteries and miracles were first composed and acted by the clergy, and were given in the churches. The theatre was "the church, soaring to its majestic height, receding to its interminable length, broken by its stately divisions, with its countless chapels and its long cloister, with its succession of concentric arches. What space for endless variety, if not for change of scene!" In 1210 the miracle-plays were excluded from the churches by Innocent III., and the clergy were forbidden to act in them. They were not, however, proscribed or disapproved. By degrees, a greater variety of personages was introduced. An element of fun was brought in to arouse merriment in the spectators. The plays were performed especially in connection with the great festivals which drew together large assemblies. In process of time, comic or carnival plays began to be acted, in which the ceremonies of the Church were travestied, and priests and monks made to figure in a ludicrous way. The motive was a relish for coarse mirth, with no irreligious intent. By the introduction of types from real life along with the abstractions, in connection also with historical persons, the moralities were transformed into the modern secular drama, which was fully developed in England in the Elizabethan age.

The religious
plays.

PERIOD VII.

FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE POSTING OF LUTHER'S THESES (1294-1517).

THE DECLINE OF THE PAPACY AND MOVEMENTS TOWARD REFORM.

CHAPTER I.

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY FROM BONIFACE VIII. TO THE COUNCIL OF PISA (1294-1409).

THE growing indifference with which Western monarchs treated the commands of Martin IV. and of his successors showed that there was a new force at work in society adverse to papal dominion. This was the spirit of nationalism, the tendency to political centralization, which involved an expansion of intelligence and an end of the exclusive sway of religious and ecclesiastical interests. The enfranchisement of the towns, the rise of commerce, the crystallization of European society under the influence of the crusades, and the new conception of monarchy, were the principal signs of the coming of a different order of things. The change which had taken place became apparent when Boniface VIII. (1294-1303), a pope who cherished to the full extent the theories of Hildebrand and Innocent III., ascended the throne which had become vacant through the resignation of Celestine. He aimed to restore Sicily to the King of Naples, to pacify Italy by overthrowing the Ghibellines, and especially his own enemies, the Colonnas, and to judge in the quarrel between Philip the Fair of France, and Edward I. of England.

Contest of
Boniface
VIII. and
Philip the
Fair.

In Sicily he failed. In Italy he had just enough success to draw upon him the hatred of the people, while in his attempts to mediate between the French and English kings he involved himself in a struggle which was to bring on his ruin. Neither Edward nor Philip would listen to the pope's commands. Boniface then resolved to force them to peace

by cutting off the chief source of their revenue. He issued, on February 24, 1296, the famous bull, "*Clericis laicos*," in which, after declaring that long tradition exhibits laymen as hostile and mischievous to clergymen, he forbade all taxation of ecclesiastics by emperors, kings, or princes, without the authority of the Apostolic See. In resisting this attack on kingly authority, Philip took the lead. It was not until after Edward's clergy had refused to vote him the needful supplies that he retaliated, and then he quickly

January,
1297.

brought them to terms by depriving them of the royal protection. The French king did not wait so long.

He struck a blow at the papal treasury by forbidding the exportation of gold and silver from the realm without his sanction. Thus the contest in which the Hohenstaufens had perished was taken up by Philip, although France throughout the middle ages had been the most faithful protector of the papacy, and his family had been established by the popes on an Italian throne as a bulwark against the empire.

August 17,
1296.

When Boniface wrote to Philip in a tone of haughty remonstrance, his complaints and his threats were met with the assertion that before there were any clergy the King of France ruled over his realm. To this it was significantly added, that the "*Holy Mother Church, the spouse of Christ, is composed not only of clergymen but also of laymen ;*" that clergymen are guilty of an abuse when they try to appropriate exclusively to themselves the ecclesiastical liberty with which the grace of Christ has made us free, and that Christ himself commanded to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's. Philip did not stand alone in this attitude of resistance to the aggressions of the pope. He was supported even by the French clergy. Boniface, thus deserted by his natural allies, was ready to be reconciled to the king, that he might devote all his strength to the destruction of his Roman enemies, the Colonnas. The royal ordinance and the papal bull were now both explained away, and the king's noble ancestor, Louis IX., was made a saint. It was not long before Philip and Edward were ready to submit their differences to Boniface, if he would act, not as pope, but as Benedict Cajetan, a private individual. This he consented to do, resolving to give to his decision the sanction of papal authority, and thus win by craft what he had failed to extort by bold assertion. Philip was dissatisfied with the award, and was

1298.

exasperated by the form in which the acceptance of it was enjoined. He did not hesitate to receive the exiled Colonnas at his court, nor to conclude an alliance with Albert, titu-

lar King of the Romans, whose election Boniface had annulled. He was surrounded by his great lawyers, Peter Flotte, William de Plasian, and William Nogaret, stout defenders of royal prerogatives, who were ready to assist him not only in breaking down feudalism, but also in placing bulwarks around the civil authority in its contest against the encroachments of the Church. The hierarchy was thus confronted here, as in other countries, by a body of learned men, the guardians of a venerable code, who claimed for the king the prerogatives of Cæsar, and could bring forward in opposition to the canons of the Church canons of an earlier date. In the meantime a rebellion broke out in Scotland, and when the pope attempted to interpose between Edward and the Scots, the English Parliament in 1301 indignantly repelled his pretensions. But at Rome, Boniface was the spectator of a scene which might well lure him to a mistaken confidence in the papal power.

The year 1300 had been set apart for a jubilee, and all who should visit the tomb of St. Peter had been promised indulgence and absolution. There streamed to the city vast crowds of pilgrims from all parts of the West. They were so eager to look upon the sacred relics that many lost their lives in the press. Immense contributions were brought to the altars. The pope, however, was not allowed to rejoice long in these expressions of the piety of Christendom. The pontifical legate, Bernard, Bishop of Pamiers, whom he sent to the French court, was a man whose animosity against Philip soon drew upon himself the charge of treason, and involved Boniface in a bitter quarrel with the king. Decree after decree went forth from Rome, and finally the bull "Unam sanctam" was issued, which made the belief that every human creature is subject to the pope to be necessary to salvation. The clergy of France, and even the doctors of the civil law, were summoned to the Holy See, to sit in judgment on the rebellious monarch. When all these efforts failed, Boniface fixed September 8, 1303, as the day on which Philip's deposition should be proclaimed, and his kingdom laid under an interdict.

Philip was not passive under these attacks. He forbade the clergy to obey the summons to Rome, on penalty of confiscation of their property. He sent forth an answer to a letter purporting to have been written by Boniface, and asserting in an offensive manner the supremacy of the pope. This answer began with the words : "Philip, by grace of God, King of the French, to Boniface, who as-

1299.

The jubilee
at Rome.

The bull
Unam sanc-
tam, Novem-
ber 18, 1302.

sumes to be the chief pontiff, little greeting or none at all," and it closed with the assertion that all who thought the king subject to anyone in temporal things were fools and madmen. One of the papal legates was ignominiously denied an audience with the king, and the bull which he brought was publicly burned in Notre Dame on February 11, 1302. Philip now believed himself

Philip's appeal to the nation.

strong enough to make an appeal to the nation. In April

he assembled the representatives of the clergy, the nobles, and the commons, and in this meeting of the estates of the realm he received assurances of their support. In another assembly, held the following year, Boniface was accused of heresy, simony, ecclesiastical tyranny, and blind hatred toward the King of France; and then an appeal was made to a general council, and to a future legitimate pontiff. But these verbal weapons were not the king's only resort. William of Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna were in Italy, and on September 7th they forced themselves into the presence of Boniface, in his own town of Anagni, and, assailing him with rude words, and even blows, made him prisoner. He had scarcely escaped from the insults of Philip's emissaries and entered what he supposed was his loyal capital, when he again found himself in the midst of another set of bitter foes. This was too much

Death of Boniface, 1303.

to bear, and the aged pontiff died, broken-hearted, on October 11th. Later in the century his career was concisely described in the epigram, "He entered like a fox, reigned like a lion, and died like a dog." "The papacy had first evinced its power by a great dramatic act. Its decline was manifested in the same way. The scene at Anagni stands in striking contrast with the scene at Canossa."

The wrath against Boniface which was felt by the Ghibellines finds expression in Dante, who calls him "the chief of the new Pharisees," and makes St. Peter himself, in Paradise, brand him as a usurper. The indignant poet accuses him of absolving from sin before it was committed, and for this crime consigns him to perdition. Celestine was canonized by Clement V. in 1313; yet for abdicating the papal office, to make room for Boniface, Dante places him at the mouth of hell, as one disdained alike by mercy and justice:

"I looked, and I beheld the shade of him
Who made through cowardice the great refusal."

Inferno. iii., 59, 60.

The contest of Philip and Boniface incited the learned to an

investigation of the relations of the Church to the State. The views of papal supremacy advocated by rigid churchmen encountered resistance. Egidius de Colonna, a monk, and at a later date Archbishop of Bourges, held that the spiritual and temporal powers were distinct and independent, each being ordained of God. From this fundamental principle he argued that the King of France, in civil matters, was subject to no superior. His contemporary, John of Paris, attacked the extravagant pretensions of the popes by attempting to deprive them of their historical foundation. The pope could not, he said, receive from Christ jurisdiction over the affairs of laymen, because Christ himself did not possess it. A few years later, in opposition to the political ideas of Thomas Aquinas, his master in theology, Dante wrote his noted treatise on monarchy. In this work he maintains that if mankind would enjoy the blessings of peace, justice, and liberty, they must unite under the rule of one. Historically, such needful unity has only been realized in the empire which the Romans won by their valor, and whose rightful dominion Christ sanctioned by being born under its sway and by submitting to die at the hands of its officers. Dante did not acknowledge the validity of the Donation of Constantine, although he seems not to have suspected its genuineness. He denied the authority of the later papal decretals, and those allegorical interpretations of Scripture which were always on the lips of supporters of the papacy. In the empire it was the duty of the popes to guide men's souls; God had appointed the emperor to govern them in their temporal affairs. Apart from the great influence of this book, and outside of Italy, the question of the origin of the empire and the nature of monarchy in general provoked earnest investigation. In Germany, especially, legists and theologians plunged into historical and critical inquiries upon the foundation of civil authority and the ground on which papal interferences with secular government professed to repose.

In the meantime the papacy itself had been brought under the power of France, and had begun the period of its "Babylonian captivity" at Avignon. The successor of Boniface, Benedict XI., annulled the decrees against Philip and his nation, but refused to join in the scheme to vilify the dead pope's character. After Benedict's death, which soon occurred, the king planned to secure the election of a pope favorable to his interests. Through the successful intrigues of the French cardinals, Bertrand, Archbishop of Bordeaux, a former enemy of Philip, pledged

Literary attacks on papal usurpations.

d. 1316.

d. 1306.

Dante on monarchy.

The Babylonian captivity.

himself, if he should be made pope, to reconcile the king and his supporters to the Church, to grant to him a levy of a tenth from the French clergy, and to investigate the charges against Boniface. There was one article of the agreement kept secret, and it still remains a matter of surmise. Bertrand was chosen, and was consecrated in Lyons as Clement V. Not long after, he removed the seat of the papacy to Avignon, on the borders of France, and belonging to the King of Naples, the pope's vassal. Thus began the foreign residence of the popes, or what is known as the Babylonian captivity. From this time the prestige of the papacy began to wane as rapidly as, in the preceding centuries, it had grown. This fall was due to the general change in society, to which reference has been made, but it was accelerated by influences which were dependent to a considerable extent on the doings of the popes themselves. During a great part of the period of the Babylonian captivity the papacy was enslaved to France, and administered in the interest of the French court. This degrading subservience marked in a peculiar degree the relations of Clement V. to Philip. The wealth of the Templars had become an object of the king's cupidity. The members of the order were tortured and confessions of strange and blasphemous initiatory rites were wrung from them. The chief accusations against them were a denial of Christ, homage paid to the idol called Baphomet, and unnatural lewdness. Their property was confiscated. Some of them were burned and others were driven into exile. The pope supported the king in his proceedings, and in the year 1312, at the Council of Vienne, he abolished the order. When Philip pressed for the condemnation of Boniface, Clement skilfully avoided the difficulty by freeing from the censure of the Church those, with few exceptions, who accused or contended against the late pope, and by committing the investigation of the charges to the Council of Vienne, which he knew would stoutly defend the memory of the Vicar of Christ. Upon the death of the Emperor Albert, in 1308, the pope was obliged to practise duplicity in order to satisfy his French master, and yet to carry out his own wishes. He publicly recommended the election of Charles of Valois, Philip's brother, and in private urged the electors to choose Henry of Luxemburg. But while Clement took this cringing attitude toward the King of France, he assumed a bold and aggressive position in relation to Germany, England, and other Catholic countries. France was willing, as long as the papacy remained her tool, to indulge the popes

c. 1305-1314.

1309.

Suppression
of the Tem-
plars,

in extravagant assertions of authority, which could only have the effect to aggravate the opposition of other nations.

In 1310 the emperor, Henry VII., whose election Clement had promoted, made a brilliant progress through Italy. For a time the glories of the Holy Empire seemed to revive. The pope was alarmed, and when Henry denied his pretensions to temporal supremacy he pronounced upon him the ban of the Church. The emperor's sudden death in 1313 put an end to the conflict and gave Clement an opportunity to act on the theory that during a vacancy in the imperial office the pope, as overlord, was regent.

Shortly after, Clement himself died, and there ensued a fierce struggle between the French and Italian parties among the cardinals, the Italian party desiring to put an end to the Baby-

Contest of
John XXII.
and Louis
of Bavaria.

1316-1334.

lonian captivity. John XXII., the new pope, at his election promised never to mount a horse except to go to Rome, and kept his promise by proceeding forthwith in a boat to Avignon. John profited by the double election of Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria to exercise more completely in Italy those rights which, as regent, his predecessor had claimed, and to plot for the elevation of the King of France to the throne of the empire. As soon, however as Louis had overcome his antagonist at Mühlendorf, he began to resume the imperial prerogatives in Italy. He was immediately summoned to

1322.

the feet of the angry pontiff, to answer for his presumption in taking the title and exercising the powers of the King of the Romans, without the papal sanction. When Louis did not appear, the pope excommunicated him, and summoned the German princes to a diet to depose him and to elect King Charles of France. This new conflict between the empire and the papacy, had it not occasioned the notable writings which it called forth, would have been but a pitiful reminiscence of those old wars between the mightiest of the emperors and the most famous of the popes. The papal anathemas were disregarded in Germany, and to the pope's diet there came only one elector, and he the brother of Louis's rival.

This was but the beginning of John's troubles. He ventured to pronounce the belief of the Franciscans, that Christ and his apostles possessed all things in common, a heresy. The General of the Order, Michael of Cesena, wrote a tractate against the errors of the pope, in which he appealed to the "Universal Church and a general council." Finally, under his leadership, the spirituals espoused the cause of Louis of Bavaria. Thus there were arrayed against John the men who represented the highest religious

ideal of the age, and whose unselfish zeal attracted the homage of the people. One of the greatest of the Franciscan scholars, William of Occam, composed a treatise on the power of the pope. He went beyond his predecessors in arguing that the Church, since it has its unity in Christ, is not under the necessity of being subject to a single primate. He placed the emperor and the general council above the pope, as his judges. In matters of faith he would not allow infallibility even to general councils. "Only holy Scripture and the beliefs of the universal Church are of absolute validity." Such were the attacks upon the papal authority from the religious and theological side.

The cause of Louis and the rights of the empire were defended by Marsilius of Padua, the great theoretical politician of the age, in his "Defensor Pacis," or Advocate of Peace. He attacked the papal theory of society, and proceeded to give a history of the rise and growth of papal pretensions.

The work of
Marsilius of
Padua.

He swept away all the temporal power and jurisdiction of the priesthood and of the papacy by proclaiming one fundamental principle, which was that the supreme authority in the state is the whole body of citizens, or the greater portion of them. According to their will kings reign and princes decree justice. To them alone belongs the power of excommunication, dispensation, whenever that is right, and of appointing and depriving the clergy. Every person, of whatever condition, is subject to the ruler chosen by them. A general council, if it is to be valid, must be summoned by them, or by him, on their authority, and must be composed of priests and laymen. To a council so constituted belongs the superintendence of the Church, the making of needful laws, and the interpretation of doubtful passages of Scripture, which is the sole authority in matters of faith. It is not the Old Testament law, upon which the papacy is wont to base so many claims, which is necessary for salvation, but the law of the New Testament, and not even that can be enforced by temporal penalties. To teach its precepts, to preach the gospel, and to administer the sacraments are the only functions of the priesthood. In his historical investigations he pointed out that in the early Church presbyter and bishop were synonymous. He denied that Peter was supreme over the other apostles, and even denied that he can be proved to have ever visited Rome. The ascendancy of the Roman Church, and its power over the empire had gradually grown up out of the necessities of the times, the weakness of princes, and the usurpations of the popes. The suc-

cessor of St. Peter was really no more than an officer to oversee the affairs of the Church and to preside in its councils.

These opinions sounded strange in the ears of men accustomed to think of the pope and the priesthood as holding the keys of the kingdom of heaven. But although they might alarm those who first heard them uttered, there was in them a power of self-propagation which would avail to win for them an acceptance in coming generations.

The Germans continued to disregard the anathemas of the pope and to support the cause of their king. In 1327 Louis made a progress into Italy to receive the imperial crown, and to enjoy a few short months of triumph. The end of the expedition was humiliating; but at this juncture Pope John relieved the embarrassment of his antagonist by again entangling himself in theological disputes. Death interposed to save the heretical pontiff from the investigations of a council about to be called by his ecclesiastical and political enemies. His successor, Benedict XII., 1334-1342. was so completely under the power of the French king, Philip VI., that, contrary to his own earnest desire, he was obliged to remain at Avignon, and to keep up the strife with the emperor. The states of Germany now came out more strongly in support of Louis. They affirmed the justice of his cause, and set forth the wrongs done him by the pope. In 1338 the electoral 1338. princes solemnly declared that the Roman king receives his appointment and authority solely from the electoral college.

The emperor lacked the courage to withstand his enemies with boldness, and the wisdom to pursue his aims with prudence. It was not for the defence of the empire against the pope that he put in practice the theories of Marsilius, but for the aggrandizement of his own house. He annulled the marriage of Margaret of Maultasch, and then removed, by a dispensation, the further obstacles to her union with his own son. This invasion of ecclesiastical rights, for clearly selfish ends, lost for him the confidence of many of his supporters in Germany. But once more the pope, this time Clement VI. (1342-1352), by the unreasonableness of his demands, and by his plots to set up a rival emperor, Charles IV., saved Louis 1347. from ruin and assured to him the loyalty of his subjects until his death, a few years later. The partisan contests which the Avignonese pontiffs had so long maintained against the emperor seemed to end in the triumph of the pope, but really weakened the hold which the papacy had upon the respect of mankind.

Meanwhile Europe was groaning under the burdens laid upon it by papal avarice. The revenues of the court at Avignon were supplied by means of extortions and usurpations which surpassed all precedent. When it was intimated to Clement VI. that he was putting forth unheard-of claims, he replied that his predecessors did not know how to be pope. But his tyranny was made possible by the success with which popes, aided by monarchs who used their interference in order to obtain preferment for favorites, had for over a century been transmuting pretensions into rights. The multiplied reservations of ecclesiastical offices, even of bishoprics and parishes, which were bestowed upon unworthy persons by the popes, or given to persons already possessed of lucrative places; the claim of the first-fruits, or annats—a tribute from new holders of benefices—and the levying of burdensome taxes upon all ranks of the clergy, especially those of the lower grades, were among the methods resorted to for replenishing the papal coffers. The effect of these various forms of ecclesiastical oppression was the greater when it was known that the wealth thus gained went to support at Avignon an extremely luxurious and profligate court, the boundless immorality of which has been vividly depicted by Petrarch, an eye-witness.

In England there had long been a growing spirit of resistance, which was naturally quickened now that the papacy had become the instrument of France. Two important statutes of Edward III. were the consequence—the statute of provisors, which devolved on the king the right to fill the Church offices that had been reserved to the pope, and the statute of *præmunire*, which forbade subjects to bring, by direct prosecution or appeal, before any foreign tribunal, a cause which fell under the king's jurisdiction. These measures were followed, a few years after, by a refusal to recognize the papal claims, which were based on the homage rendered to Innocent III. by King John, and to pay the tribute of one thousand marks which he had promised. The papacy was no sooner rid of one antagonist, Louis, than it was threatened in another quarter. The King of France was no longer able to protect his ecclesiastical ally even from the robber bands which preyed on the country.

In Italy the outlook was still worse. Ever since the removal of the papacy to Avignon, Rome had been distracted by feuds of leading families which built for themselves strongholds in the city. In 1347 the Romans, fired by the enthusiast Rienzi, had sought to restore Roman liberty under the

Extortions
and troubles
of the Avi-
gnon popes.

Resistance in
England.

1351.

1353.

Close of the
Babylonian
captivity.

ancient republican forms. The people soon awoke from their dreams of the past to find themselves in still worse confusion. The States of the Church groaned under the despotism of petty nobles. For a time the papal ascendancy was restored through the efforts of Cardinal Albornoz, who was a soldier as well as an ecclesiastic.

Moved by the condition of his temporal domains, Urban V. left Avignon amid the cries of his grief-stricken cardinals: "Oh, wicked pope! oh, impious father! whither does he drag his sons?" He did not long remain in Rome.

After taking part in the empty pageant of an imperial coronation, the dangers which surrounded him and the entreaties of his prelates persuaded him to return to the quiet of Avignon. But the tyranny of the legates soon caused a general revolt of the papal cities. It seemed that their allegiance would be gone completely unless

the pope should come back to Rome. Gregory XI. no longer heeded the outcries of his cardinals, but listened to the exhortations of St. Catherine, a Dominican devotee, whose asceticism and devotion gave her such authority that she could offer her counsels to a pontiff. In 1377 he returned to Rome, where he died a year later, with the enemies of the papacy still unsubdued. Thus ended the Babylonian captivity.

Of the twenty-three cardinals who at that time constituted the sacred college, sixteen were at Rome when Gregory XI. died. Their movements were closely watched, lest they should escape to Avignon and elect another pope subservient to French interests. Both the Italians and the two factions of the

Beginning
of the great
schism.

French—the Limousins and the Gallicans—who hated each other bitterly, were frightened into unanimity by the rising tumults, and chose Prignano, Archbishop of Bari. The Limousins, in proposing one who, although an Italian, owed his ecclesiastical preferment to the Cardinal of Limoges, thought to find in him a servant, but soon realized that they had set over themselves a rude and self-

willed master. Urban VI., the new pope, as a monk rigid and upright, showed himself not in the least cautious or politic, and he soon alienated the French cardinals by personal affronts and crude attempts at reform. Their feelings were still more embittered when they learned that he had no intention to return to Avignon. They retired to Anagni, where,

The rival
popes,
Urban VI. and
Clement VII.

having declared the election of Urban invalid, on the ground that it was procured by violence, they chose Robert of Geneva (Clement VII., 1378-1394), a man who possessed those qualities of leadership which Urban so griev-

ously lacked. The two Italian members of the college gave in their adhesion to Clement. Urban, deserted by all, proceeded to create twenty-eight new cardinals. There were now two sacred colleges, and therefore the death of either pope could not put an end to the strife. Political enmities determined the position of each European nation with regard to the rival claimants of the triple crown. Italy sided with her countryman; France supported Clement, with the hope of regaining her former ascendancy over the papacy, and, therefore, England gave her obedience to Urban. Scotland hated England, and Flanders hated France; hence the former revered Clement, the latter, Urban. In like manner, political motives brought Naples, Castile, and Aragon to the side of the French pope, and Germany, Hungary, and the northern kingdoms to the side of the Italian. Thus was Europe divided, and the great schism begun.

The cause of Urban seemed to be that of Italy, and it was an Italian band, led by Alberigo da Barbiano, which conquered Clement's Breton mercenaries and forced him to retire to Naples, whence he soon sailed away to Avignon. Urban proceeded to depose the Neapolitan queen, Joanna, who adhered to his rival, and declared the kingdom forfeited to Charles of Durazzo, an heir of Charles the Lamb by a collateral branch. In opposition to him, Joanna adopted, with the sanction of Clement, Louis of Anjou, who was descended from the daughter of the same king. Urban blindly sought to win the fairest cities which belonged to the Neapolitan kingdom for his worthless nephew, Francesco Prignano, and when the now victorious Charles resisted his demands, the pope determined upon the ruin of the king, that he might set Francesco on the throne. This shameless nepotism prevented him from recog-

1386.

gnizing Ladislas as the successor of Charles, and therefore opened the way for the reassertion of the Angevin claims. The aggrandizement of his family, not the cause of Italy or the true interests of the papacy, absorbed his attention. His cruelty to his cardinals made him hated and distrusted of all, and yet men adhered to his cause for the reason that he stood between them and a pope subservient to France.

Boniface IX., Urban's successor, had none of his learning and little of his piety; but he was affable, sagacious, and what was especially needful, he possessed the instincts of a statesman. He immediately recognized Ladislas as King of Naples; he brought the States of the Church together by appointing as vicars of the pope the nobles who had power in

Boniface IX.
(1389-1404)
and Clement
VII.

their cities ; and in Rome he laid the foundations of papal sovereignty. But as a pope, Boniface had one vice which could not be atoned for, even by the purity of his private life. Not satisfied with the vast sums which he gained by the jubilees of 1390 and 1400, he resorted to shameless simony. The members of his court defended the practice on the ground that the pope could commit no sin.

But the schism had already entered upon a new phase. Earnest men in France and England began to inquire where lay the cause of the evil, and what could be done to put an end to the disorders it had wrought. The spectacle of rival popes—Clement resting in inglorious ease at Avignon, Urban heading a partisan warfare in Italy—each imprecating curses on the other, stirred up

Wyclif to declare that the very papal office was poisonous to the Church. The English nation was so united

in their resistance to ecclesiastical encroachments that this champion of civil and kingly authority against papal claims could utter

such words without fear. When, a few years later, Boniface tried to carry his schemes of extortion into England, his attempt was met by still more stringent statutes.

In France, as early as 1380, the University of Paris began its efforts to heal the schism. It abandoned the project of summoning a general council as impracticable, and advocated the plan of abdication. But almost insuperable difficulties hindered the success of any scheme that could be devised.

There were two popes, each believing himself to be the true successor of St. Peter, and therefore the fountain of all spiritual power, from whom prelates and councils derived their authority. Gathered about them were two sacred colleges, the members of which defended respectively the pontiff whom they had elected, because, in case he was no pope, they were no cardinals. Each party had its adherents among the nations of Europe, and the nations were then in a state of chronic warfare. To persuade or to compel the rival popes to abdicate was almost impossible, because even if they were willing to lay down their offices, each would fear lest, after he had resigned, the other would refuse to copy his example. Nor could the nations, separated as they were by mutual distrust, join in any consistent policy or method of dealing with the pontiffs whom they severally supported. And yet, notwithstanding these obstacles, the Paris theologians urged upon the French court the necessity of inviting or forcing Clement to resign, hoping that the nations attached to Boniface would pursue

Vain efforts
to heal the
schism.

1324-1384.

1390-1393.

the same method in relation to him. These efforts, seconded by the French cardinals, hastened Clement's death; but before the king had time to interpose, the same cardinals, that they might have a chief who would in any event defend their interest, hastened to choose Benedict XIII., who promised to resign whenever the welfare of the Church should seem to a majority of them to call for such a step. It soon became evident that so staunch a believer in papal supremacy and one so well versed in the canon law as Benedict was, had in mind no way of healing the schism except by the universal recognition of himself as the true vicar of Christ. He would not yield, even when, through the influence of the more violent party of the university, the French court, and along with it Sicily, Castile, and Navarre, withdrew from the obedience of Benedict, and Marshal Boucicaut besieged the papal palace at Avignon. The moderate men, Peter D'Ailly and Nicholas de Clémangis, had been skilfully detached, the former by preferment to the Bishopric of Cambrai, the latter to the office of papal secretary.

In the meantime, Boniface IX. had contented himself with making pious professions in order to stave off an analogous procedure against himself, and had been steadily pursuing his own political aims. The madness of the French king and the strife between the Dukes of Burgundy and Orleans made the policy of France waver, and soon, a reaction having set in, the nation returned to

Benedict's obedience. On the death of Boniface and of his successor, Innocent VII., no progress toward an agreement having been made, all parties became weary of the strife and determined to bring it speedily to an end. To accomplish this object was the sole duty which the Roman cardinals most solemnly enjoined upon the venerable and pious man, Gregory XII., whom, in 1406, they elected pope. France, spurred on again by the persistent demands of the university, was gradually cutting off the power of Benedict over the French Church. There was no time to be lost. It was arranged that the popes

Benedict
XIII., 1394-
1424.

should meet at Savona, there to heal the disorders that afflicted the Church. But now Ladislas began to tremble for the safety of his crown, which would be put in jeopardy if by chance the French pope should be victorious. He sought to throw obstacles in the way of the conference. The nephew of Gregory whispered suspicions of treachery. Europe beheld these two old men, each claiming to be the vicar of Christ, each afraid that the other was fomenting some plot for his destruction, advancing toward one another

1404.

Benedict
XIII. and
Gregory XII.

slowly, and with great trepidation. The place of meeting was repeatedly changed. Gregory would go no farther than Lucca, while Benedict was at Spezzia on the coast. "One, like a land animal, refused to approach the shore; the other, like a fish, would not leave the sea." Suddenly Gregory publicly disclaimed any intention to abdicate, and created four new cardinals. His old cardinals fled to Pisa, and appealed to a general council.

In France the Paris University again raised its voice. The king, influenced by its arguments, threatened to take up a neutral position. This step Benedict met by excommunicating those who should withdraw from his obedience. The bearers of his bull were imprisoned for high treason, the document itself publicly torn in pieces, and the proclamation of neutrality was sent forth. Benedict fled to Perpignan, in the territories of Aragon. The cardinals of both popes then united in summoning a general council, to be held in Pisa the following year.

The cardinals
call a council.

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMING COUNCILS: THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY TO THE ACCESSION OF PIUS II. (1409-1458).

A council had been summoned, but men long accustomed to papal absolutism were in doubt as to what authority such a body would possess. Many of the more conservative theologians sought to find a warrant for its action in provisions of the canon law. The Gallicans, under the lead of Gerson and D'Ailly, went beyond them, holding up the principle of the supremacy of the Church and of its councils, and endeavoring to set proper limits to the power of the pope. Gerson, like Occam, maintained that the Church has its real unity in Christ, who is its head. In the Church, the mystical body established by him, is vested the power and right, which neither the provisions of the canon law nor the decrees of the pope can invalidate, to take the measures necessary to bring schism to an end. If the vicar who symbolizes its outward unity is dead, or has forfeited the allegiance of the faithful, the Church may, not only on the authority of the cardinals, but also on that of a prince or of any other Christian, call a general council, to procure a true and sole vicar. Nor is this all that may be done. Should the public peace and safety require it, the vicar may be resisted, and even deposed and deprived of all

Theory of the
Gallican re-
formers.

ecclesiastical rank. The aim of Gerson, D'Ailly, and their associates was to reduce the pope from the position of an absolute to that of a constitutional monarch, and even to place behind a general council the universal Church, as alone infallible and supreme. Such ideas would win for the council the moral support of those who discerned in the inordinate power of the papacy the source of the many evils that afflicted the Church. But the great

Council of
Pisa. assemblage which began its sessions at Pisa, on March 25, 1409, did not represent all the nations which pro-

fessed the Catholic faith. Of the more powerful monarchs the King of Spain still supported Benedict, while Ladislas, and Rupert, who was Wenzel's competitor for the throne of the empire, clung to Gregory as a political necessity. It was the first duty of the members of the council to heal the schism. This they attempted to do by decreeing the union of the two sacred colleges, and by deposing Gregory and Benedict as notorious schismatics, perjurers, and heretics. Many of the delegates wished now to proceed to the reform of the Church in "head and members," in order that an end might be put to ecclesiastical corruption, and that those abuses of the papal power which had become so flagrant during the captivity and the schism might be checked. But there were others, and these constituted the majority, who doubted the right of the council to take any further action except under the headship of the pope yet to be elected. The leaders of this party were the cardinals, who were anxious to stay the liberal movement lest it might become revolutionary. They promised that whoever of them should be chosen would prevent the council from being dissolved until a satisfactory reformation of the universal Church should have been accomplished. Then they united in the choice of Peter Philargi, the aged Cardinal of Milan. As soon as the new pope, Alexander V., had ascended the throne, many members of the council seemed wholly absorbed in seeking benefices, which his reckless prodigality was ever ready to bestow. He put off the reforming party with a few unimportant concessions, and, with specious promises to call another council, soon after dismissed the assembly.

Failure of the
council.

The flattering hopes with which its sessions had opened had been disappointed. Its measures were the result of impulse, and not of that mature deliberation which was required by the exigency. Such was the comment of Gerson. Moreover, the schism still continued, with three popes instead of two in the field. Alexander fell completely under the influence of Baldassare Cossa, the legate at Bologna, a man who was first a pirate, then a student,

and finally so successful a papal extortioner that he was rewarded by Boniface IX. with a cardinal's hat. This ecclesiastic, surpassed by few in the number of crimes of which he was accused, possessed so much political power that he was soon called to fill the vacant chair of St. Peter, and to defend it against the attacks of Ladislas. But the tempest of Italian politics was too much for even John XXIII., and he was obliged to call upon Sigismund, King of the Romans, for help, and to consent to his proposal to summon a general council. The pope regarded it as of the utmost importance that the council should be held in a place where he had more power than the emperor, but he made the fatal mistake of trusting the matter to the prudence of his legates. They yielded to the demands of Sigismund, and selected Constance, an imperial city. John was now obliged to send forth the summons to the council, which was to meet on November 1, 1414; but he still cherished the hope of being able to control it when once it had come together. The failure of the Council of Pisa to accomplish the work set before it made earnest men keenly alive to the need of putting an end to the abuses in the administration of the Church, and of finding an instant and effectual remedy for the long schism which endangered its union. Moreover, in Bohemia there was a formidable religious movement, led by John Huss and others, and stimulated by the writings of Wyclif—a movement that threatened to result in the establishment of a new and powerful sect. On the Eastern borders of Europe hovered the Turkish invader, and in the Christian countries of the West strife and confusion prevailed. The council which gathered at Constance during the last weeks of 1414, and was not dissolved until April, 1418, was the most brilliant and imposing of the ecclesiastical assemblies of the middle ages. If the number of bishops present was not so large as at some other great synods of the Church, this difference was more than made up by the multitude of inferior clergy, of doctors and of jurists, and by the unexampled array of sovereigns and nobles. The pope and Sigismund were both present, each with a numerous and dazzling retinue of officers and attendants. A throng of not less than fifty thousand people, drawn by official obligation, curiosity, the desire of gain or of pleasure, flowed into the city of Constance to witness the doings of the council. The sessions had just begun, when John came into collision with the reform party, under the leadership of D'Ailly, now a cardinal. It was the pope's purpose to procure a confirmation of the acts of the Pisan Council, which

May 17, 1410.

Council of
Constance.

John XXIII.
foiled.

deposed Benedict and Gregory, and made provision for the election of his predecessor. Thus his own position would be strengthened and he would be enabled to proceed against them as anti-popes. Having got this dangerous matter out of the hands of the council, he would then try to occupy the remainder of its sittings with the heresies of Huss and Wyclif, and by a few concessions baffle all serious attempts at reform. In opposition to this plan, D'Ailly maintained that only so far as a council really represents the universal Church, which alone cannot err, is it freed from the danger of falling into error, and that for this reason, although the assembly at Pisa is with probability believed to have been such a council, yet it is possible that it did err, as other such assemblies have erred, if we may credit the statements of the learned. Moreover, any ratification of its acts would only tend to shake the belief in its authority, and, besides, make it harder to bring the schism to an end. It was evident that the party represented by D'Ailly wished to leave the council free to negotiate with Benedict and with Gregory. Soon after, a letter came from Gregory, offering to abdicate, if his two rivals would do the same. It was now suggested by Cardinal Philaster that John, in imitation of the good shepherd who lays down his life for the sheep, should resign, and it was asserted that for the sake of the peace and union of the Church he could be compelled to take this step. In the meantime the resolution to vote by nations had crushed the design of the pope to control the assembly through the numerical preponderance of Italian prelates. The situation of John began to be critical. Terrified by rumors of accusations about to be presented against him, he solemnly promised, upon his oath, to abdicate in case Gregory and Benedict would also resign. In order to avoid carrying this promise into effect, he fled to Schaffhausen, which lay in the territory of his friend, Frederick of Austria. The council, lest the pope's action might be taken to invalidate its authority, promulgated a decree which read thus: "The Synod of Constance, regularly assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming a universal council and representing the militant Church, has its authority immediately from God, and everyone, the pope included, is bound to obey it in what pertains to the faith, and to the extirpation of schism, and the reformation of the Church in head and members." It was not long before Frederick submissively made his peace with Sigismund, and the pope, having fallen into the hands of the council, was, on May 29, 1415, deposed from office. Shortly afterwards Gregory resigned. But Benedict was obstinate, and

Deposition of
John XXIII.

when negotiations with him had proved fruitless, and he was deserted by all except the single town of Peñíscola in Spain, he was formally deposed. While the council was thus engaged in

ending the schism, it was also engaged in putting down Trial of Huss. heresy with a relentless determination. Sigismund had been anxious that Huss, the leader of the new movement in Bohemia, should come to Constance and bring his cause before the representatives of the Church. Huss consented to do so, apparently looking upon the council not as a judicial body before which he was going to be arraigned and tried, but as a great assembly in whose presence he might vindicate himself against the accusations of his enemies. The emperor then gave him a safe-conduct, which enjoined upon all lords and magnates to permit him without molestation to go and return. Despite this, not long after he arrived in Constance, he was thrown into prison. Sigismund was at first angry at such a flagrant violation of his safe-conduct, but the determined attitude of the council led him to give way. It was difficult to find any statements of Huss which, in the sense in which they were intended by him, could be declared heretical. The council, however, could plant itself on the ground that he disowned the authority of the Church, and acknowledged no authority as final except the Scriptures, as he understood them. Moreover, his ethical theory of the foundation of the right of rulers, lay or ecclesiastic, to govern, a theory in which he followed Wyclif, excited sincere alarm. The leaders of the reform party were ready to pull an offending pope from his throne, but they were wedded to the doctrine of hierarchical authority. They felt it the more necessary, therefore, to mark the limits of the reform which they aspired to achieve. The violent, mob-like deportment of the council contrasted very unfavorably with the noble serenity and self-possession of their victim. When his sentence was being read, Huss turned and fixed his eyes upon Sigismund. The blush that overspread the king's face disclosed the verdict of his conscience, that he ought to have kept faith even with a heretic. Huss was burned in July, 1415, and his friend and disciple, Jerome of Prague, one year later.

Thus far the council had proceeded with vigor and unanimity. But political animosities began to aggravate the difficulties which Choice of a pope. beset all essays at reform. England and France were at war. Sigismund, having sought in vain to mediate, allied himself to England, and thus lost the "truly international place" which he had previously held in the council. Movements within the body itself were equally destructive to its efficiency. Ger-

son, by his persistence in urging the condemnation of Petit, who, after the assassination of the Duke of Orleans, had written a book in defence of tyrannicide, lost his influence over the assembly. D'Ailly became the leader of the cardinals and the defender of their authority as representatives of the Roman Church. He sought to hasten the election of a pope, lest the reforming spirit of the council should become revolutionary. The Germans, and at first the English, warned by what took place at Pisa, were anxious that the reformation of the Church in "head and members" should precede the papal election. But their movements were regarded with suspicion by the French, the Spaniards, and the Italians. The cardinals, taking advantage of this national jealousy, forced the liberal party from one compromise to another, until they won from Sigismund his consent to the election of a new pope. A decree was then adopted which forbade certain papal extortions and provided for the frequent assembling of general councils. All other reforms were left to be carried out by the pope, with the assistance of the council then in session, or with the aid of deputies from the nations. On November 11, 1417, Otto Colonna was chosen, and took

Failure of
the council.

the name of Martin V. The new pope soon showed his real attitude toward the reforming movement. He sanctioned the abuses on which the Roman court had flourished during the reign of John XXIII., and, before the council was dissolved, asserted the papal supremacy in terms which contradicted the doctrine of conciliar authority, which had been solemnly promulgated in its fourth and fifth sessions. The members of the council, wearied by their long-continued and apparently futile labors, were in no mood to withstand the schemes or pretensions of the pope. They satisfied themselves with a decree embodying a few reforms upon which they were all united, and voted to leave the rest to be arranged in concordats with the several nations. Martin, having bestowed upon them plenary absolution, which was to extend until death, dissolved the assembly. The substantial failure of this council to achieve reforms which thoughtful and good men everywhere deemed indispensable was a proof that some more radical means of reformation would have to be found.

Martin had rescued the papacy from the dangers which threatened it at Constance, and he now undertook to restore its lost prestige. He revived the pontifical authority in the papal states and brought a new prosperity to Rome. In France he recovered those prerogatives of the Roman see which had been taken away by the royal ordinances of 1418. But in England his

Troubles in
Bohemia.

passionate denunciation of the statutes of provisors and *præmunire* were not heeded. He reluctantly assembled a general council at Pavia, in obedience to the decree adopted at Constance, and then, having transferred it to Sienna, and fomented divisions among the few that were present, procured its dissolution. The ascendancy of the Catholic Church was seriously endangered in another quarter. The destruction of Huss and Jerome of Prague had sent a thrill of indignation through the greater portion of the Bohemian people. Underlying the movement of which Huss was the principal author was a mingled national and religious feeling. The Hussite reforms, and especially the demand for the cup, which in the administration of the sacrament had long been withheld from the laity, were supported by the Slavic population, but were opposed by the Germans. The Council of Constance and Martin V. resolved to suppress the rising heresy by force. Bohemia was a constituent part of the German empire, and therefore to Sigismund was allotted the task of conquering the Bohemian heretics, who were called Utraquists, because they partook of the communion in both kinds. There soon arose in Bohemia a powerful party which went far beyond the Utraquists in their doctrinal innovations and in antipathy to the Church of Rome. The Taborites, as they were styled, rejected transubstantiation; they appealed to the Bible as alone authoritative, and refused to submit to the decisions of the popes, of the councils, or of the Fathers. Opposition only turned their enthusiasm into fanaticism. In Ziska, the most noted of their leaders, they found a general of fierce and stubborn bravery; and under his guidance the force of the Hussites became well-nigh irresistible. In 1420 the moderate Utraquists, or Calixtines, embodied their beliefs in the celebrated Four Articles of Prague. They provided that the word of God should freely be preached, that the sacraments should be administered in both kinds, that priests and monks should be divested of their worldly goods, and that a strict Church discipline should be maintained. The Utraquists and Taborites viewed each other with mutual suspicion, and would unite only on the occurrence of a crisis involving danger to both. The crusades, undertaken by the authority and at the command of the Church, filled Bohemia with the horrors of war; but they wholly failed to subdue the heretics, who laid aside their own feuds to confront the common enemy. It was a conviction of the futility of these efforts which prompted men to urge Martin to summon the Council of Basel. By the advice of Cardinal Julian Cesarini, the papal legate, who had shared the disastrous overthrow

of the last crusading army, the council decided to invite the Bohemians to a free discussion of the existing differences.

In the meantime Martin had died, and his successor, Eugenius IV., became alarmed at this dangerous activity of the

1431-1447.

council. His attempts to procure its dissolution were resisted by Cesarini, and were met on the part of the council by a re-affirmation of the doctrines of Constance, and a declaration that the synod then assembled at Basel could not be dissolved, transferred, or prorogued without its own consent. In order to avoid the national jealousies which had hindered the work at Constance, the council formed itself into four committees, the members of which were taken in equal proportions from the various ranks of the clergy and doctors of the law who represented each nation. The negotiations with the Bohemians were successful. Having first carefully obtained abundant guarantees for their personal safety, and solemn pledges that they should have a full and free hearing, the Utraquist delegates, representative of both the leading parties, the Calixtines and Taborites, presented themselves at Basel. After long consultations, and the sending of an embassy from the council to Bohemia, the Hussites obtained certain concessions, which were set forth in a document termed the "Compactata." In them the articles of Prague were so modified as to preserve, as far as possible, the authority of the Church and of the hierarchy. Such a

Defeat of the
Taborites.

compromise could only tend to divide the Calixtines and the Taborites into mutually hostile camps. An armed conflict ensued, in which the Taborites were thoroughly vanquished. Thenceforth the power remained in the hands of the Utraquists, who were desirous of approaching as nearly to the doctrines and rites of the Catholic Church in other countries as their convictions would allow. The successful issue to which the council had thus brought the Bohemian question won for it the adherence of the princes of Europe, and enabled it to compel Eugenius (in December, 1433) to acknowledge its lawfulness in spite of his own bull of

Negotiations
with the
Greek
Church.

dissolution. The negotiations to bring about the union of the Greek and Latin Churches plunged the pope and the council into a new quarrel. The Eastern emperor was willing to treat with whichever party could the more powerfully influence Western monarchs to join in a crusade against the Turks, who were threatening Constantinople. The dominant party at Basel regarded the counter-negotiations of Eugenius as a defiance of the conciliar authority. From this time many of the reforms which they undertook were designed to cripple the power of

the pope. They abolished all papal reservations, and all those fees which were customarily paid both before and after ecclesiastical appointments. Nor were they content with depriving the pope of the largest portion of his revenues. They so changed the method of papal elections as to subject him completely to the authority of councils. But their obstinate persistence in appointing Avignon as the place for the proposed conference with the Greeks caused the more moderate members of the council to publish a decree in favor of Florence or Udine. The pope forthwith turned the schism to his own advantage, confirmed the decree of the minority, and called the Council of Ferrara. The Greeks, after some wavering, were won over by the papal emissaries. The council first met at Ferrara, and was a year later transferred to Florence. The debates on doctrinal differences, especially on the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the addition by the Latins of "filioque" to the Nicene formula, threatened to be interminable. The Greek emperor, John Paleologus, was anxious to complete the union, so that he might obtain the fulfilment of some at least of the promises of assistance which had flattered his hopes. Urged on by him, the Greeks consented to subscribe to statements of doctrine whose phraseology was sufficiently comprehensive to shelter their own beliefs, and to a declaration of the primacy of the pope "saving all the rights and privileges" of the four patriarchs of the East. Eugenius in turn promised to maintain, for the defence of Constantinople, two galleys and three hundred soldiers. This was all that the emperor could procure to offer to his people, who were indignant at his base desertion of orthodoxy. The prestige which the popes gained from this affair was increased when, one after another, the remaining sects of the East made a show of submission.

A few days after the Council of Ferrara opened, the prelates who had remained at Basel under the presidency of D'Allemand suspended Eugenius as contumacious, and declared that the administration of the papacy devolved upon the synod there assembled. The more powerful nations of Europe deprecated these extreme measures of the council, as well as the acts of retaliation to which the pope had resorted. Charles VII. of France hastened to adopt such of the reforms enacted at Basel as would free the French Church from papal interference and extortion. Accordingly, in July these decrees were embodied in the Pragmatic Sanction, drawn up at the Synod of Bourges. Germany pursued the same course. The Church was declared neutral

Extreme
measures of
the council.

by the electoral princes, and a year later an acceptance of the Basel reforms, similar in its provisions to the Pragmatic Sanction, was decreed at the Diet of Mainz. The council, whose radical pro-

ceedings had caused the desertion of many prelates, now
1439. deposed Eugenius and drew from his comfortable seclusion

Amadeus VIII., Duke of Savoy, whom they elected pope. By this act, which opened the way for another schism, it lost the moral support of Europe, and after a few years sank into insignificance, along with its pope, who bore the name of Felix V. It was now the aim of the Roman court to recover the obedience of Germany. The weakness and irresolution of the king, Frederick III., and the selfish policy of the electors, offered a fair field for successful intrigue. Prominent among those who took part in the

negotiations was *Æneas Sylvius Piccolomini*. He was
Æneas Sylvius. a brilliant and sagacious man, cultivated and aspiring, but not free from dissolute ways, which, in his own judgment, rendered it for a long period unseemly for him to take orders. Facile and flexible, he was quick to perceive any turn in the course of events, and immediately to take advantage of it. He attached himself successively to several prelates of opposite parties, then was an official and an eager partisan of the Council of Basel, and finally was appointed one of Frederick's secretaries. Being sent to Rome as an envoy, he became reconciled to Eugenius, and promised to be as valuable a friend of papal pretensions as he had previously been an active and formidable enemy. It was largely as a result of his efforts that, in return for a vague confirmation of the rights of the national Church, the obedience of

Germany was restored to the dying pope, on February 7,
Papal reign of Nicholas V. 1447. Nicholas V. was not slow to reap the fruits of this triumph. The Concordat of Vienna abandoned the

reforms of Basel, and hardly left to the German Church those liberties which Martin had granted to it at Constance. When the jubilee year of 1450 came, and the pope beheld the thousands of pilgrims flocking to Rome, he could reflect with gratitude on the fact that the papacy had survived the schism and the reforming councils, and that now it seemed to be regaining its ancient position and influence in Europe. It was the purpose of Nicholas to give strength and stability to the papal power. He erected fortresses in the lands of the Church and strengthened the walls of the capital. He adorned not only Rome, but also other cities, with magnificent buildings. He made a vast collection of manuscripts, and thus laid the foundation of the Vatican library. As a patron of men of let-

ters he vied with Cosimo de' Medici and Alfonso of Naples. In accordance with his plan, "Rome was to be a missionary of culture to Europe, and so was to disarm suspicion and regain prestige." But Rome, for which he had done so much, almost broke out into open rebellion against him. The last two years of his pontificate were embittered by his melancholy reflections on the capture of Constantinople, and his own ineffectual attempts to unite the West in a crusade against the Turk.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY IN THE LAST HALF OF THE FIFTEENTH CENTURY.

THE Germans were inclined to look upon the crusade as a mere pretext for filling the coffers of the Roman court. They asked: "Why do we rob our children of bread that we may fight the Turk when the chief pontiff spends the treasure of St. Peter on stones and mortar?" Their enthusiasm was not aroused by the appeals of Calixtus III., of Calixtus III., in whose mind there was a measure of 1455-1458. the old crusading zeal, mingled with a blind affection for his nephews. Of these two rival impulses the first did little harm to the infidel, while the second, by raising Roderigo Borgia, the future Alexander VI., to the cardinalate, wrought great mischief in the Church.

Ever since the death of Eugenius, Æneas Sylvius had been plying the princes and prelates of Germany with inducements to become supporters of the Roman see. He had turned Pius II., his back upon his past life, except that he retained his 1458-1464. fondness for literature. He had taken orders, had been made a bishop, and then a cardinal. And now, upon the death of Calixtus, he was exalted to the office thus left vacant. As Pius II., he repudiated that defence of conciliar authority which, as Æneas Sylvius, the partisan of Basel, he had framed, and he launched the anathemas of the Church against any who should presume to appeal from the Roman pontiff to a future council. Pius refused to involve the papacy in the dynastic quarrels of Europe. He pursued the safe policy of recognizing as monarchs those who actually held the power, at the same time that he reserved for adjudication the rights of the claimants. But this course could not satisfy the

French King, Louis XI., who had abolished the Pragmatic Sanction in the hope that Pius would aid him in winning Naples for the house of Anjou. Finding himself deceived, Louis took revenge upon the pope by renewing its provisions.

No one saw more clearly than Pius that the military power of the Turks threatened the safety of Europe. But it was not far-seeing statesmanship alone which impelled him to urge on a crusade. He sought by it to restore the prestige of the papacy, and thus to be able to overwhelm the Bohemian king, Podiebrad, who had resisted his attempts to break down the compacts. When all other resources were of no avail, he resolved, feeble as he was, to put himself at the head of a crusading army. But he lived only long enough to reach the shores of the Adriatic and to gaze upon the fleet of his Venetian allies.

National rivalries and the ambition of princes had thwarted every attempt of the popes to mould Europe into a confederacy to confront the common foe. These repeated failures show that the moral force of the papacy as an international power was hopelessly undermined. The Roman court was not slow to recognize the growing weakness of its position. But even so upright a pontiff as

Paul II., 1464-1471. Paul II. could do little to gain for it new strength. In

Italy he sought to promote order throughout the papal domains, and to stand aloof from the intrigues of the surrounding princes. He loved splendor, but refused to thrive on extortion. He desired to live at peace with all men, and yet he did not hesitate to plunge Europe into war in order to overwhelm the heretical King of Bohemia.

Sixtus IV. revived the project of a crusade, only to learn that religious feelings and motives had little sway over the hearts of

Sixtus IV., 1471-1484. men. He felt that he could no longer look to the na-

tions of Europe for obedience, nor even for protection against the restless adventurers and ambitious princes who continually threatened the papal states. He sought to give strength to the papacy, not by reforming it and thus recovering something of its ancient moral power, but by giving it a position beside the principalities of Italy, and by enriching his relatives with lands and other possessions that they might support it. His fierce energy would brook no opposition. When the Medici threw obstacles in the way of the aggrandizement of his nephew, Girolamo Riario, he was so eager to overthrow them that he uttered only feeble protests in condemnation of the plot against the lives of Julian and Lorenzo. Julian was assassinated on the steps of the altar during the cele-

bration of high mass ; but the conspiracy failed, and those who took part in it received summary vengeance at the hands of the Florentines. The pope forthwith excommunicated Lorenzo, laid the city under an interdict, and joined the King of Naples in making war upon it. The diplomacy of the great Florentine citizen soon deprived Sixtus of his royal ally ; and that event, together with the capture of Otranto, in 1480, by the Turks, forced him to accept a merely formal submission from Florence. In order to gain Ferrara for his nephew he first united with Venice in a war against its duke ; but, alarmed at the dangers with which the continued hostility of the Italian League threatened him, he forsook his Venetian allies, and excommunicated them for not making peace at his bidding. Little regard was paid to this act, and the failure of the pope to gain any advantage in the contest that ensued hastened his death. Innocent VIII., after waging a fruitless war with Naples, made an alliance with Lorenzo de' Medici, and, by following his advice, won the title of "Constant Guardian of the peace of Italy." He received an annual tribute from the sultan for detaining his brother and rival as a prisoner at the papal court, instead of sending him to lead a force against the Turks, the enemies of Christendom. With parental zeal, Innocent sought goodly marriage portions for his children, and made the halls of the Vatican resound with the noise of unaccustomed festivities.

Innocent
VIII., 1484-
1492.

Meanwhile several momentous events had taken place in the West. In England the Wars of the Roses had ended with the accession of Henry VII., of Lancaster, and his marriage with Elizabeth of York. By the union of Charles VIII. of France with Anne of Brittany the authority of the crown had been established over the last great feudatory. In Spain, the heirs to Castile and Aragon had been united, in 1469, by the marriage-bond, and their kingdom had been consolidated by the conquest of Granada in 1492. At this critical time Cardinal Borgia ascended the papal throne, under the name of Alexander VI., and pursued the same policy as Sixtus IV., but with more boldness and skill, and with greater good fortune. Under his influence the papacy sank to the level of the other Italian principalities, and showed itself ready, like them, to sacrifice even the welfare of Italy for its own temporal advantage and for the exaltation of the Borgia family. Alexander did not shrink from any form of diplomatic intrigue, nor from war, nor even from assassination, in order to realize his purposes. He was stronger

Alexander VI.,
1492-1503.

than rival princes, in that he could wield those spiritual weapons of excommunication and interdict which had not yet become wholly blunted. He began his reign with a stern repression of the criminal outbreaks which had grown so frequent at Rome under his weak predecessor. He formed a close alliance with the King of Naples for mutual defence against Charles VIII. of France, who was advancing to Italy, as the heir of the house of Anjou, to seek the Neapolitan crown. He besought the Sultan of Turkey to come to his aid. But, despite all his efforts, Charles was everywhere triumphant. Florence opened her gates to him, and Savonarola, the great Florentine preacher, saw in him the deliverer of Italy and the reformer of the Church. The pope bowed before the storm, but

only for a moment. He soon formed a powerful league, through fear of which the French monarch was obliged to desert his newly won kingdom. By his influence Savonarola, who still encouraged Florence to maintain its treaty with France, was brought to the scaffold as a heretic. Alexander had not been forgetful of his children. They either received princely titles and domains, or, as in the case of Cardinal Cæsar, rich benefices. The pope had labored to destroy the power of France in Naples; he now, in 1499, helped Louis XII. to establish it in Milan. His son Cæsar, having renounced his ecclesiastical dignities, received a French title and the hand of a French princess. Alexander grasped this opportunity to expel the petty tyrants from the cities of the Romagna, and to consolidate it into one great principality, held directly from the Roman see by his son Cæsar as duke. There was no one to interpose. Milan had fallen before the arms of Louis. Venice needed the pope's help to drive back the Turks. Naples,

with the papal sanction, was being divided between France and Spain. Alexander seemed at the goal of all his aims, when he was stricken with a fever and died. The baseness of his character, the sensuality of his court, and the mysterious murders which filled Rome with terror, gave currency to the stories of his enemies, which pictured him, as well as his children Lucretia and Cæsar, as monsters of iniquity. No doubt the pope and his son were bad enough; but Lucretia was probably the innocent victim of her father's schemes, since from the time of her marriage with the Duke of Ferrara she was honored and beloved by all.

Alexander's attention had not been given solely to Italian politics. In virtue of the rights derived from Peter to the apostolic see he had assumed to give away, "of his mere liberality," to Spain

and Portugal, all the lands thenceforth to be discovered. Spain was to have all territory west of a meridian line one hundred leagues from the Azores, and Portugal all territory east of that line. Afterward the two kings agreed that the dividing line should be three hundred and seventy leagues from the Cape de Verde Islands. Soon after Alexander died, the principality which he had built up for his son in the Romagna fell to pieces. Cæsar, whose interests were viewed with indifference by Pius III., was powerless to prevent the return of the exiled lords, supported as they were by the arms of Venice. The early death of Pius raised

Julius II.,
1503-1513.

to the papal throne Julius II., the nephew of Sixtus IV. His spirit was untamed, despite marked experiences of vicissitude of fortune. He determined to rescue the States of the Church from the domination of petty tyrants, as well as from the encroachments of Venice. "What Alexander VI. had done ignobly as a means of enriching his son, Julius II. would do with persistent resoluteness for the glory of the Church." He first got possession of those castles which were still loyal to Cæsar, and by his negotiations with France and Germany frightened Venice into giving up all the other towns except Rimini and Faenza, and then led an expedition in person to overthrow the lords of Perugia and Bologna. The power of Venice still endangered the success of his plans. To destroy forever its ascendancy in Northern Italy, he promoted the

1508.

formation of the league of Cambrai. In this league, Germany, France, and Spain united with the pope to divide the dominions of Venice which were on the main-land. Julius, when he had thus got the Venetians into his power, would listen to no overtures not involving absolute submission. He drove them not only to give up the towns of the Romagna which they held, but also to surrender their valuable ecclesiastical privileges and their rights over navigation in the Gulf of Venice. Now that he had gained his object, he sought to check the advancing power of the French. He tried to detach Ferdinand of Spain from the league by investing him with the kingdom of Naples, in disregard of the claims of France. He declared war against the Duke of Ferrara, the ally of Louis XII., and in the midst of winter led an army against Mirandola, one of his fortresses. But the pope, unaided, was not strong enough to cope with the King of France. He was obliged to retire from his hard-won possessions in the Romagna. A few disaffected cardinals went over to the French side, and issued the summons for a council at Pisa. Julius deprived this weapon of its force by convoking another council to meet at the Lateran.

Neither council amounted to anything more than a phase of the warfare between the pope and the French king. The most triumphant result of papal diplomacy was the formation, in 1511, of the holy league between Julius, Venice, and Spain, and, later, England, to recover the possessions of the Church. It was not, however, until Maximilian of Germany entered the confederacy that

1512. the pope could rejoice in the overthrow of the power of the French in Italy. Florence still maintained her alliance with France. Julius resolved to break this bond by the restoration of the Medici, who had been exiled at the time of the expedition of Charles VIII. This result he achieved by the help of Spain. The pope's obstinate determination to leave no part of his plans unrealized caused him to subject Italy to the influence of one foreign invader after another. Julius was no less distinguished as a patron of art than as a warrior. He laid the foundation of St. Peter's Church. He summoned Michael Angelo to decorate the Sistine Chapel with frescos, and Raphael to adorn with beautiful designs the walls of the Vatican.

When Julius was dead the Romans mourned for him as for one "who had enlarged the Apostolic Church, overthrown tyrants, and rescued Italy from the hands of the French." And yet the dominant party among the cardinals, wearied by his intense activity, by his violent and belligerent temper, chose for a successor the son of Lorenzo the Magnificent, John de' Medici, who was of a kindly disposition and was much more fond of literature, art, and music, than

Leo X.,
1513-1521. of political intrigue and war. Leo X. had been made cardinal at the age of thirteen, and was pope at thirty-seven.

He was free from the revolting vices which had degraded several of his predecessors, but was more devoted than was fitting to profane studies, to hunting, jousting, and pageants. Sarpi, in his "History of the Council of Trent," after praising the learning, taste, and liberality of Leo, remarks with fine wit, that "he would have been a perfect pope if he had combined with these qualities some knowledge of the affairs of religion and a greater inclination to piety, for neither of which he manifested much concern." The pope, in spite of his inclination to peace, found himself obliged not only to resort to diplomacy, but also to arms, to protect what his predecessor had gained. The defeat of the French in Northern Italy, and the successful invasion of France by Henry VIII. of England, made Louis XII. no longer a dangerous enemy, but he was a monarch whose safety was necessary to the maintenance of a proper balance of power between the European nations. Therefore, Leo was quite

ready to receive the submission of the cardinals who had summoned the schismatic council, and to become reconciled to the monarch who had striven to overthrow Julius, his predecessor. The death of Louis brought the young and ambitious Francis I. to the throne. The pope sought to advance the fortunes of his relatives by a matrimonial alliance with the royal family of France. At the same time, however, in order to strengthen his own position, he joined a European league whose real aim was to thwart the ambitious schemes of the French king. To win the support of Henry VIII. he raised Wolsey to the cardinalate. The triumph of Francis at Marignano obliged Leo to agree to a treaty with him, even at the expense of those cities on the north of the Romagna which the valor of Julius had won. But the pope succeeded in obtaining from him the abandonment of the Pragmatic Sanction, for whose repeal preceding popes had vainly striven. This seemed to be a great victory for the papacy. In reality, however, although the Gallican Church was robbed of its liberties, the pope gained only the annats—the first year's income of the great benefices—while the power of nominating to these places fell to the king. Moreover, the coercion that was required to bring the parliament to register the new concordat, and the indignation it awakened throughout France, proved that it indicated no change in the sentiments of the nation. Leo, though at peace with Francis, did not hesitate to negotiate with his enemies. One of his sayings was: "When you have made a league with any prince, you ought not on that account to cease from treating with his adversary." The European monarchs were not much disturbed by his genial duplicity; but he who watched to gain something from every change in the political situation saw his own international importance rapidly dwindling, and himself obliged to accede to arrangements made with little consideration of his interests. The Council of the Lateran having, according to the papal declaration, done all that was necessary for the welfare of Christendom, was dissolved in 1517 "on the very verge of the greatest outbreak which had ever threatened the organization of the Church."

CHAPTER IV.

REFORMERS BEFORE THE REFORMATION: THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING.

BEFORE the end of the fourteenth century the scholastic movement had well nigh spent its force. It was undermined by the reappearance of Nominalism, and especially by the teaching of one of the most acute of all the schoolmen, William of Occam, and by his disciples. Occam taught that common

Fall of scholasticism.

William of Occam, c. 1280 c. 1347.

nouns, the names of classes, are like the signs of algebra. They are a convenient mode of designating individuals, which alone exist. The general notion and its name are both representative fictions; and this double source of inexactitude shuts out the possibility of metaphysical or theological science. The truths of religion are directly revealed by God in the Bible and to the Church. So far from being capable of demonstration, they may stand in direct contradiction to the logical conclusions of what we call science. Thus the foundation of scholasticism, which aimed to verify the creed by philosophy, was cut away. Still more was done by Occam for the future in his attacks upon the claim of papal infallibility, and the doctrine of the power of the pope over kings and in temporal affairs. He was the champion of the Franciscan order, to which he belonged, in the contest in behalf of the rule of poverty, which was waged against the pontiffs. He was the animating spirit of a group of men—one of whom was Marsilius of Padua—who were protected at Munich, and stood by Louis of Bavaria in his conflict with the Avignonese popes. Occam asserted

Doctrines of Occam.

that even a general council might err; that faith might depart save from the souls of a few devout women; that the hierarchical system might be given up, if the good of the Church required it; that a king has all the powers of an ecclesiastical person, except such as spring from ordination, and that if an emergency requires it, the emperor could appoint or depose the pope.

In his old age there was a partial reconciliation between Occam and Clement VI.; but it is not known that he retracted even this last proposition, which the pope required as the condition of granting him absolution. Occam's influence was felt by Wyclif, and

His influence.

affected strongly the Gallican leaders in the reforming councils. It extended still later. His principles, and those of his disciples, were the maxims on which the resistance of

Protestant princes to the authority of Rome was, to a considerable extent, based. Luther was a student of Occam, praises him as the most ingenious of the schoolmen, and derived from him his conception of the Lord's Supper—a conception suggested by Occam as a reasonable view, yet as one that furnishes an instance of the possible inconsistency of faith and reason. Notwithstanding the revolutionary influence that went forth from Occam, he was a conscientious and orthodox believer in the dogmas of the Church. His whole method of discussion is scholastic, and, in theology, he added a third school, that of the Occamists, to the previously existing parties, the Thomists and the Scotists. He was honored by his pupils with the titles of “Most Learned,” “Invincible Doctor,” etc.

Thomas Bradwardine, for a short time before his death Archbishop of Canterbury, was an able mathematician, as well as philosopher. His main work was in defence of the position

Bradwardine, 1290-1349. that all human holiness is exclusively the fruit of divine grace. As the correlate of this view he asserted predestination. He was styled “Doctor Profundus.” Wyclif is among those who held Bradwardine in high honor.

In the last half of the fifteenth century the logical ideas of Occam were inculcated by Gabriel Biel, who was not “the last of the schoolmen,” as he has often been called, but was the last of the very remarkable men who adhered to the scholastic method. As regards the papal power, he adhered to the position taken by the Councils of Constance and of Basel.

In relating the history of the papacy we have noticed certain religious movements antagonistic to the mediæval type of Christianity. The earlier of these had for their aim the over-

Insurgent movements. throw of the exclusive domination of the priesthood, deeply infected as it was with worldliness and immorality. Prominent among the sects which arose were the Albigenses, whose doctrines were tinged with heresies somewhat akin to the ancient Manichæism, but whose lives were characterized by self-denying devotion and zeal for moral purity. The same general movement produced the Waldenses, a party not tainted with Manichæan doctrine, who denied the exclusive right of the clergy to teach the gospel, and who, wherever they went, kindled among the people a desire to read the Bible. The influence of the Spiritual Franciscans, and of the bands of praying men and women called Beg-

The Gallicans. hards and Béguines, tended in the same direction. A reformatory movement of a different kind was initiated by the Gallican theologians whom we had occasion to describe in con-

nection with the reforming councils. They aimed to substitute for the papal conception of the hierarchy the idea that ecclesiastical authority resides in the universal Church.

But besides the sectaries, whose existence testified to a profound dissatisfaction with the mediæval order of things, and a deep craving, mingled though it was with ignorance and superstition, for a simpler type of Christianity, and the conservative theologians whose only aim was to reform the administration of the Church and the morals of the clergy, there were individuals who are appropriately called radical reformers—men who in essential points anticipated the Protestant movement. Although their efforts to bring in a more enlightened doctrine and a purer life were to a large extent ineffectual, they prepared the way for more successful efforts when the time for reform should fully come. The most remarkable of all these reformers before the Reformation was

Radical reformers. John Wyclif. He was born in the year 1324. He Wyclif, 1324-1334. early won distinction at Oxford, and, after holding several honorable positions at the university, became doctor of theology. While he was warden of Canterbury Hall he was the leader of the secular clergy in their defence—which finally proved unsuccessful—against the aggressions of the aspiring mendicant orders. In his writings he repeatedly attacked the practices of the monks, as well as the doctrine of the excellence of poverty, which lay at the foundation of their societies. He stood forth in the character of a champion of civil and kingly authority against papal encroachments. By this attitude he not only commended himself to parliament as a valuable supporter of its policy, but also gained the respect and friendship of the king's advisers, the great nobles, such as John of Gaunt, who shielded him from the attacks of the hierarchy. Thus Wyclif was not harmed although he boldly taught that a papal decree has no validity except so far as it is founded on the Scriptures, and that the exercise of the power to bind and loose has no effect save when it is conformed to the judgment of Christ. He urged that the clergy be forbidden to interfere with civil affairs and temporal authority. Despite the efforts of the churchmen, his ethical doctrine, that the right to hold property and to rule is forfeited by a disobedience to the will of God, did not excite much alarm. He asserted it, to be sure, simply as a speculative principle. But when he attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation, maintaining that the bread and wine remain unchanged, although the body and blood of Christ are really present, he lost the cordial support of many who had hitherto looked upon him with favor. His teach-

ing was condemned and suppressed at the university, but he was allowed to end his days, undisturbed, in his parish of Lutterworth. Wyclif's attacks upon the spiritual domination of the priesthood were not limited to that main support of sacerdotal power, the miracle of transubstantiation. He asserted that in the primitive Church there were but two sorts of clergy, and was opposed to the existence of the multiplied ranks of the priesthood—popes, cardinals, patriarchs, monks, canons, etc. He spoke against the necessity of auricular confession, and doubted the scriptural warrant for the rites of confirmation and extreme unction. He advocated also a simpler form of Church worship. The incompetence of the clergy and their neglect of their parishes led him to send forth preachers who were to go from place to place to labor wherever there was need. The greatest service which he did the English people was his translation of the Bible, and his open defence of their right to read the Scriptures in their own tongue. It was Wyclif's relation to the politics of his day that enabled him to attack the mediæval and papal Church in almost every feature which distinguished it from Protestantism, and yet to live out his days. His death did not seem at once to destroy the power of the movement which he inaugurated. But the bold petition of the Lollards, as his followers were called, to parliament for the reform of the Church, aroused the hierarchy to take vigorous measures for their repression. It was not, however, until the reigns of Henry IV. and Henry V., when the relations of the kings to the clergy were changed, that the persecution of them began. The Lollard party gradually fell to pieces, and the principles of its founder gained but few adherents except among the poor and obscure classes, whose aspirations after social and industrial equality they seemed to countenance. Wyclif's translation of the Bible was his most permanent work for the English people. His philosophical and doctrinal teachings had an influence, indirect, perhaps, yet important, upon the religious history of Bohemia.

A movement had already begun in Bohemia, under the leadership of Conrad of Waldhausen, who had been called from Austria by the Emperor Charles IV. to assist in the reformation of the clergy. What Conrad's fiery zeal did for the German population the mystical preaching of Militz did for the Slaves. They attacked the vices of the clergy as well as of the people. Neither of them was to be turned aside by the enmity of the priesthood, nor even by threats of persecution. The ideas which they had proclaimed were set forth more systematically in

Bohemian
reformers.

the writings of Matthias of Janow. Over against the vast system of rites and ordinances he placed the Bible, and the Holy Spirit in the heart of the believer, as sufficient to provide a rule of life. The reform movement was soon to acquire a national and even European significance. The writings of Wyclif had been brought over to the University of Prague, and had found there enthusiastic expounders. At the head of this rising party stood John Huss, who was drawn to the English reformer by their common zeal for the purification of the Church. In 1402 Huss was appointed to preach at the new Bethlehem Chapel, which had been founded in order that the common people might hear the word of God taught in their own tongue. The efforts of the reformers won the sympathy of the Bohemians, all the more because the reformers were opposed by the Germans. Their cause was espoused by the king, Wenzel, whose claim to the imperial crown brought him into antagonism to the Bohemian hierarchy. The contest of the two parties led to a change in the constitution of the university, which gave the preponderance of power to the natives. Hence the German students, who had previously had control, left in a body. One result of this great exodus was the establishing of the University of Leipsic. Huss was now made rector at Prague, and the ascendancy of the reform party was assured. The Bohemian hierarchy, supported by papal authority, resorted to repressive measures. Huss, however, refused to stop preaching at the chapel, and appealed from the pope poorly informed to the pope better informed. His impassioned condemnation of the iniquitous sale of indulgences called down upon him the papal excommunication. Prague was laid under an interdict while the heresiarch should remain there. He was now persuaded by the king to go into exile until peace should be restored. From his secure retreat he sent forth letters to his people and writings for the Church. Huss had less theological acumen than Wyclif. He agreed with the English reformer in advocating philosophical realism and predestination. Unlike him, he was to the last a believer in the doctrine of transubstantiation. He was a clear and fervid preacher. His words and his life manifested a heart-felt zeal for practical holiness. He propounded a lofty conception of the functions and duties of the clergy, and exalted the Scriptures above the dogmas and ordinances of the Church. In these characteristics Huss was not excelled by any other ecclesiastical reformer, before or since. After remaining in exile nearly two years, he readily accepted Sigismund's invitation to appear at the Council of Constance, and there

Huss, 1369-
1415.

to vindicate himself and the cause of reform before the representatives of the universal Church. It was at Constance that he met his death, July 6, 1415, in the manner already described. The execution of Huss, and, one year later, that of Jerome of Prague, who shared his reforming spirit, stirred the hearts of the Bohemians to a still more fervent and determined advocacy of reform. The important place which this movement occupied for many years in the affairs of Europe has before been explained.

There were other men, less renowned, however, than Wyclif and Huss, who attacked the system of mediæval Christianity in some of its principal features. Among them was John Wessel,
1420-1489. Wessel, a teacher of theology at several of the leading universities, who clearly and earnestly set forth the doctrine of salvation by faith alone, and argued against the alleged infallibility of bishops and pontiffs. He avowed so many of those beliefs which later became the fundamental tenets of the reformers, that Luther declared that if he had read sooner the works of Wessel, it might have been plausibly said by his enemies that he borrowed everything from them. Another of these men was Jerome

Savonarola,
1452-1498. Savonarola, whose interest lay much less in doctrinal reform than in the purification of morals. Born at Ferrara, and destined for the study of medicine, he became disgusted and alarmed at the wickedness which he beheld everywhere about him, and entered the Dominican order. His first attempts at preaching in Florence, whither he had gone in 1482, produced little effect upon the luxurious and pleasure-loving inhabitants of that city. But he was not daunted by this failure. As his sense of the corruption of society became keener, he stood forth as a preacher of righteousness and of a judgment speedily to come. He no longer used the reasonings of the schools, but discoursed, as did the prophets of old, in the name of the Most High. Florence, which at first would not listen to him, at length filled the cathedral with awe-struck hearers. In 1491 Savonarola was made prior of the Convent of St. Mark. His influence was fast becoming dangerous to the supremacy of the Medici. He directed the sharpest invectives against the immoralities which flourished under their rule. And yet Lorenzo treated him with kindness, and called him to his death-bed to receive his words of counsel and admonition, and to be uplifted by his prayers. After the death of Lorenzo, Savonarola rapidly gained a ruling influence in the affairs of the city. He became vicar-general of the newly formed Tuscan Congregation of Dominicans. His prophecies of impending judgment found a

speedy fulfilment in the coming of the French. Through the personal respect, amounting to awe, with which he inspired the king, Charles VIII., he was able to hasten the departure of this conqueror, whose continued presence threatened the safety of the city. Now that the rule of the Medici was overthrown, he urged the people to the adoption of a democratic constitution. Florence assumed a changed aspect. The carnivals were no longer scenes of lawlessness and immorality. Along the streets went processions of children bearing olive branches and chanting sacred songs. And yet, though Savonarola had seemingly wrought a religious and moral revolution in the city, he had prepared the way for his own destruction. His prophetic enthusiasm saw the will of God in the political changes which were taking place about him. He earnestly supported a policy which made for him bitter enemies, and among them the pope, Alexander VI. When the pope found that he could not bribe the powerful preacher with the offer of a cardinal's hat, nor reduce him to silence by repeated admonitions, he excommunicated him. Savonarola pronounced this excommunication void, as contradictory to the wise and just law of God. His enemies finally succeeded in discrediting him, for a time, with the people, and in procuring his arrest. While in prison he busied himself with writing a tract on the fifty-first psalm, in which he set forth views of justification so like those expounded by the later reformers that Luther published it with a laudatory preface. He was soon brought to trial and condemned to death. On May 23, 1498, with two of his followers, he was hanged, then burned, and his ashes thrown into the Arno.

There was still another class of men who prepared the way, even though unconsciously and indirectly, for the coming Protestant revolution. These were the mystics, who, while remaining in the church, opposed to the prevalent dogmatic type of piety a religion more inward and spiritual. Eckhart (1260-1329) carried the idea of absorption in God to the verge of Pantheism. Ruysbroeck, Groot, and Suso, each in his own way, exalted feeling above knowledge. Although the best of the schoolmen had been characterized by similar tendencies, mysticism assumed a more distinct form with the decline of the scholastic theology. Societies calling themselves "Friends of God" grew up in the South and West of Germany and in the Netherlands. The most prominent of their preachers was John Tauler. From a member of this same mystical school came forth a little book called "The German Theology." Luther, who repub-

The Mystics.

Tauler,
1290-1361.

lished it in 1516, was impressed with its thoughts, and said that he had been taught by it more of what God, Christ, man, and all things are, than by any other book except the Bible and the works of St. Augustine. Another celebrated book, the "Imitation of Christ," written by Thomas à Kempis, reflects admirably the characteristic spirit of this school, and has had among devotional books an unparalleled circulation and influence.

Other forces, still more indirect but no less powerful, lent their aid in ushering in a new civilization and a purified Christianity. The growth of national languages and the beginnings of a vernacular literature mark the decline of the control of mediævalism over the minds of men. Many of the writings which now began to appear in Italy, France, Germany, and England sharply censured the vices of the clergy and the corruptions of the church. One of the most interesting of these is the "Vision of Piers' Ploughman," by William Langland, written about 1362. In this poem he asserts that the calamities of mankind are due to the worldliness and riches of the clergy, and especially of the mendicant orders. Reason and conscience are, according to him, the true guides of the soul, and a righteous life better than trust in papal indulgences. His contemporary, Chaucer, the greatest of the early English poets, in his allusions to the friars and to the temporal usurpations of the higher clergy, reminds one of Wyclif. In Italy, Dante and Petrarch chastised the vices and tyranny of the papacy, while Boccaccio in his humorous tales held up the lower orders of the clergy to unbounded ridicule. At the same time, the sacerdotal theory was left untouched, and those who bitterly condemned popes and prelates for their usurpations of worldly power still bowed submissively before their spiritual authority.

This same period witnessed the revival of learning, an event of immeasurable influence in moulding the new era. It was the Renaissance—the re-birth of letters and art—that scattered the mists of ignorance, and of the superstition and bigotry connected with it. Italy was the source of this great intellectual movement. Trained in her schools and inspired with a contagious enthusiasm, scholars went forth to promote it in the other countries of the West. Petrarch, the Italian poet, was the first to show men the pleasure to be found in the study of the classical authors, and to fill their minds with a passion for antiquity. During the first half of the next century, the monasteries of the West were ransacked for manuscripts of the ancient

The vernacular literature.

The revival of learning.

1304-1374.

poets, philosophers, and orators. Scholars did not give their attention exclusively to Latin. In the last years of the fourteenth century, Chrysoloras, a learned Greek, had been persuaded to teach at Florence and in other cities. Students visited Greece and returned with manuscripts, frequently of authors whose names had long been well-nigh forgotten in Italy. As the dangers from the Turks which threatened the remnants of the Eastern Empire increased, Greek scholars turned their eyes westward, and began to seek a peaceful and hospitable exile among the inquisitive and ardent devotees of the new learning in Italy. One of the most distinguished of these Greeks was Bessarion. This migration of the learned and of their treasures was stimulated by the capture of Constantinople, in 1453. The passion for everything that belonged to antiquity had now become all-absorbing. Princes vied with each other as patrons of the new learning. They expended large sums of money in the collection of manuscripts and in the foundation of libraries. Into this generous rivalry Pope Nicholas V. eagerly entered. Just at the period when the interest in books was at its height, came the invention of printing. This art was soon carried to a high degree of perfection, especially at the Aldine press—the press of Aldus Minutius—at Venice. By means of printing presses, dictionaries and grammars, versions and commentaries, for instruction in classical learning, as well as copies of the ancient writings themselves, were multiplied with a rapidity truly wonderful, and scattered far and wide.

The art of
printing.

The Fathers
and the
Scriptures.

This movement had a profound influence on the subsequent religious history of mankind. It spread before the eyes of men new fields of thought. In the room of faint and partial glimpses, it opened to them a clear vision of the mental life of the gifted nations of the past. It held out to them culture as a rival claimant for that interest which the most active minds had so long given almost exclusively to religion. The products of the intellectual life of antiquity came into contact with Christianity, not in its primitive and purer form, but overlaid with mediæval formalism and superstition. Out of this contrast there were bred, in some cases skepticism and indifference, in others an earnest search after the fundamental truths of religion. But there were other consequences more distinct and positive. The writings of the Fathers were brought forth from obscurity and compared with the creed of the church. The scriptures of the Old and New Testaments were studied in the original languages. This renewed knowledge of the sources of Christian doctrine must clearly

reveal the differences between the native simplicity of the gospel and the doctrinal and ecclesiastical system which professed to be founded upon it. The widespread intellectual ferment which ensued could not leave the fabric of Latin Christianity undisturbed.

Scholasticism was tottering to its fall. The scholars of the new learning, elated with their discoveries, derided the scholastic theologians for their narrowness, their endless wrangling and overdrawn subtlety, their uncritical method and ignorance of history. The writings of Aristotle, to which the schoolmen attached so much weight, were now read in the original, and the mistranslations and false interpretations of the older theologians were exposed and ridiculed. In truth, however, Scholasticism had already run its course and lost its vitality. After Nominalism had been reinstated by Occam and his school, it was no longer possible to seek for truth by simply developing the contents of reason; it was necessary to go to the facts of nature and of inner experience. While a door was thus opened for skepticism, the way was also prepared for a more vital faith. But although the scholastic theory had lost its former supremacy, it was still vigorously defended, especially at the universities of Paris and Cologne. Several universities, however—notably, Heidelberg and Tübingen—took the lead in admitting the new studies. When, in 1502, the Elector Frederic, of Saxony, organized a university at Wittenberg, it became a seat of classical learning and of Biblical researches. It was destined soon to become the hearthstone of the Reformation.

The revival of learning assumed, north of the Alps and especially in Germany, characteristics different from those pertaining to it in Italy. In Italy it was less distinctively religious, and more speculative, and even skeptical. Companies of scholars formed themselves into academies. One of the most important of these was that founded in Florence by Cosimo de Medici. At its head was placed Marsilio Ficino, an enthusiastic student and translator of Plato, and, at the same time, a conscientious priest. He wrote erudite theological works, one of which was on the immortality of the soul. He sought to find in the teachings of his favorite philosopher anticipations of Christian doctrine. But although he frequently mingled Platonic fancies with Christian teachings, he did not sympathize at all with the indifference and even skepticism with which many of the Humanists, as the lovers of the new learning were called, looked upon the Church and Christianity. It was against these unbelieving tendencies that Savonarola wrote his "Triumph of the Cross." The most strik-

Fall of scholasticism.

Tone of the Renaissance in Italy.

ing instance of the widely prevailing spirit was Pomponius Lætus and his Roman Academy. He cared nothing for religion and despised the clergy. He loved only Rome and the relics of its ancient grandeur. He and his companions took Roman names, and applied to one another the titles of the pagan priesthood. Although but few of the humanists pushed their idolatry of antiquity as far as did Pomponius, many of them were infected by an Epicurean infidelity, caught from Lucretius and the dialogues of Cicero. They were inclined to doubt the essential doctrines of Christianity, and even the essential truths of natural religion. The council of the Lateran (1512-1517), under these circumstances, felt itself called upon to affirm the immortality and individuality of the soul. Even those who believed what was taught in the church were fond of dwelling on the heroes of pagan antiquity as models of virtue or teachers of wisdom, apparently lifting them to the rank, if not above the rank, of prophets and apostles.

A curious example of the ethical spirit of the period is furnished by "The Prince," a work composed by Machiavelli, in which the famous Italian scholar and statesman sets forth the maxims that should guide a ruler in his management of the affairs of state. The principles which he advocates are contrary to the very essence of Christian morality. Every means, even lying and murder, are defended as worthy, if adapted to the attainment of the end in view. This book simply embodies the political morality of the age as interpreted by its wisest and most skilful statesman. It aroused no condemnation then, though the moral judgment of later times is expressed in the epithet "Machiavellian," applied to crooked and treacherous arts of diplomacy.

In Germany the new learning, from the beginning, was cultivated in a religious spirit. There was a desire to examine the writings of the Fathers and to study the Scriptures, and this not mainly from an intellectual curiosity. John Reuchlin (1455-1522), a sincerely religious man, who had studied and lectured at various universities, who at Florence had associated with the poet Politian and the philosophers Ficino and Pico della Mirandola, was the recognized leader of the German Humanists. His principal work was a grammar of Hebrew. He was interested in Hebrew, not only as being the language of the ancient Scriptures, but as that of the Jewish Kabbala. He shared with Pico and other scholars of the age the belief that in this work could be found proof and illustration of the Christian doctrines. The Do-

minicans of Cologne, who dreaded the theological errors which lurked in the mystic lore of the Kabbala, incited by Pfefferkorn, a converted Jew, and with Hoogstraten, an ignorant prior, at their head, accused Reuchlin of heresy. The charge against him was that he would not join in their project for destroying all Judaic teaching not contained in the Scriptures, by burning all the Hebrew literature except the Old Testament. In the bitter conflict which ensued the Humanists rallied around their chief. Reuchlin was efficiently supported by Francis of Sickingen and Ulrich von Hutten, knights, who were quite as ready, if the occasion were furnished, to use their swords as their pens in his defence. There was a group of Latin poets, having their centre at Erfurt, and intimate with Mutianus, a canon at Gotha, a cultivated Humanist, who had studied in Italy and was infected with the lax opinions in religion, and to some extent with the lax standards of morality, prevalent among Italian scholars. From Crotus Rubianus, Hutten, and others of the Erfurt circle, emanated the "*Epistolæ obscurorum virorum*," a pretended correspondence of the monks among themselves. The letters, written in barbarous Latin, displayed in caricature the illiteracy, bigotry, and free convivial habits of the monks. The "*Epistles*" were found to be very diverting, and were the more sought for when Leo X., in a bull, forbade them to be read. They helped the more serious defenders of Reuchlin to win the final victory.

The Renaissance in England assumed characteristics similar to those which marked it in Germany. English scholars went to Italy, and brought back to Oxford a zeal for the new learning. It was at Oxford that, in 1496, one of them, John Colet, son of a wealthy London merchant who had been Lord Mayor of the city, began to give lectures on the *Epistles of Paul*. He boldly pushed aside the artificial methods and voluminous comments of the schoolmen, and sought in simple, clear language to make real to his hearers the life and teachings of the Apostle. His lecture-room was thronged with eager listeners. Many who came out of curiosity remained to learn. Those, however, who were firmly attached to traditional ways in theology could not but be alarmed by what they believed to be the dangerous tendencies of the new style of exposition. Among the few to whom Colet looked for active sympathy in his work was Thomas More, a young man destined for the law. His gentle nature, enlivened by a brilliant mind, endeared him to every one of the little circle of friends which the new learning was gradually bringing together. The following year, Colet and More were joined by Erasmus, who

The Renaissance in England.

was soon to become the prince of the Humanists, and one of the most influential men of the age. Erasmus was already broken in health by close study and by the privations which his want of money had often obliged him to endure. He had early been thrust into a monastery by relatives who were anxious to obtain his small inheritance. His natural antipathy to the monastic life was increased by the bitter experiences of those days, and by the trouble it cost him in after years, when he had become famous, to release himself from the thralldom to which his former associates were inclined to call him back.

The new studies did not make much headway in England until after the death of Henry VII. In the young king, his son, the Oxford reformers found a monarch well disposed to the new learning. Colet, in the meantime, had become dean of St. Paul's, in London. Erasmus had carried out his long-cherished plan of going to Italy, but hearing of the accession of Henry VIII., had started to return. As he journeyed back he conceived the plan of a satire on the follies of mankind, which, when he reached England and became a guest at More's house, he wrote out, calling it the "Praise of Folly." Folly is personified and represented as pronouncing before her devotees an oration on the affairs of mankind, in which she has so all-important an agency. None of the follies of the age but come in for their share of ridicule. On these lively pages figure the sickly bookworm; grammarians and pedagogues in the fetid atmosphere of their school-rooms, bawling at their boys and beating them; scholastic theologians, wrangling over vain problems and prating about the constitution of the universe, as though they had just come down from a council of the gods—"with whom and whose conjectures nature is mightily amused;" the monks, a "race of new Jews," who will be grieved to find themselves among the goats on the Judgment Day, and to see sailors and wagoners preferred to themselves; kings who do not protect their subjects, but rob them and seek only their own pleasure; popes who, though decrepit old men, take the sword into their hands and "turn law, religion, peace, and all human affairs upside down." Here was so plain a reference to the warlike Julius II., that none could fail to see it. Such were some of the follies of mankind which Erasmus discoursed upon, to the amusement of More and a few friends. The book was soon published and rapidly passed through several editions. It was read by all who sympathized with the new studies, and by thousands—ecclesiastics included—who did not appreciate the effect of this telling satire

"The Praise
of Folly."

in abating popular reverence for the Church. Erasmus, for a time, settled at Cambridge, as professor of Greek. Meanwhile, Colet had founded, in London, at his own expense, St. Paul's school, where boys were to be taught the rudiments of sound learning. In spite of the enemies who were now trying to convict him of heresy, he went bravely forward with his work, earnestly pleading before the convocation for a reform of the clergy, and preaching on the barbarity and impolicy of war before the young king, Henry VIII. A little later, More published his "Utopia," in which he embodied kindred ideas. The work is pervaded by a sympathy for the lot of the laborers, the poor, and the distressed. In his imaginary commonwealth all are well-housed and educated. The Utopians are liberal in religious matters. They debate among themselves "whether one that was chosen by them to be a priest would not thereby be qualified to do all the things that belong to that character, even though he had no authority derived from the pope." The people make confession, not to priests, but to heads of families. Each one can choose any religion he pleases, without fear of punishment. The forms of worship are so carefully arranged that all, whatever may be their minor differences, can join in them. More expressed in this work the same abhorrence of the barbarity of war which Colet set forth in his sermons.

Erasmus had already left England and had gone to Basel, where he formed that alliance with the printer Froben which was so happy for them both and so fruitful of good to the public. In Basel he found an abode where he would be at a safe distance from his powerful patrons and would be out of the reach of secular and ecclesiastical tyranny. In 1516 he published his edition of the Greek Testament, accompanied by a new Latin translation. This work was followed by editions of Cyprian and Jerome, and translations from Origen, Athanasius, and Chrysostom. Thus Erasmus opened to the men of his generation the sources from which they might gain a better understanding of the fundamental truths of Christianity, a clearer knowledge of Christian antiquity, and a more biblical theology. The other theological writings of Erasmus, among them his commentaries and his treatise on preaching, did much to spread enlightened views of doctrine and of the nature of the Christian life. He would have the laity instructed; he wished that every people might have the Gospels and Paul's Epistles in their own tongue, and that even the humblest woman might read them. He inveighed against the multitude of ordinances, against judaizing customs and rites, by which

The theological writings of Erasmus.

the Church was burdened and the poor oppressed for the sake of enriching the clergy.

These more serious writings were intermingled with humorous and satirical works in the vein of the "Praise of Folly." Among the latter were the "Colloquies," in which the idleness, illiteracy, self-indulgence, and artificial and useless austerities of the religious were exhibited in a ridiculous light.

There were also several successive editions of the "Adages," each larger than the former, and each containing some fresh attack on the abuses of the age. Erasmus would never write anything which would give aid or comfort to the defenders of what he termed the "Pharisaic kingdom." His comments on misgovernment in the Church, on the vices and oppressions of the clergy, from the pope downward, were the more effective because they were generally put in a humorous form. They all, as Coleridge has said, possess the peculiar merit that they can be translated into arguments. In

his religious opinions Erasmus was broad and tolerant.

His liberality. He would do away with the tyranny and avarice of the court of Rome, but would leave the constitution of the Church undisturbed. He would have the creed very short, embodying only the "plain truths contained in Scripture." He left much room for individual judgment, and was for referring difficult questions, not to "the next general council"—about which men were always talking—but to the time when we see God face to face. His liking for religious liberty came partly from his personal kindness and his liberal culture, and partly, perhaps, from the consciousness that without the practice of a pretty wide toleration by rulers in Church and State he would himself fare ill. He was early recognized by the more ardent adherents of the mediæval system as one whose influence threatened to destroy their ascendancy. They were no match for him in literary combat, but they could, despite his professions of orthodoxy, continually annoy him with imputations of heresy. Some of these, however, like the condemnation of the "Colloquies" by the University of Paris, tended only to diffuse his ideas still more widely.

The influence of Erasmus was not limited to his formal publications. He carried on a vast correspondence with eminent persons—ecclesiastics, statesmen, and scholars—who were his friends and patrons. He rapidly became the foremost literary man of his time. In the extent of his influence, and in the deference paid him by the great, he has been approached by none, unless it be Voltaire, who, however different in important respects,

The humorous writings of Erasmus.

Extent of his influence.

was like him in being a wit and iconoclast, and in the keen, critical character of his intellect. His fame depended in part on the universal use of Latin as the common language of educated men. Although he had lived in England and Italy, Erasmus was acquainted with neither Italian nor English. His Latin style did not possess the classical finish of many of the Humanists, who were horror-stricken at the use of a word not found in Cicero, or, at least, not sanctioned by the best ancient authority. Latin was to him the language of every-day life, and into it his genius infused an unwonted vigor. He wrote hastily. "I precipitate," he says, "rather than compose."

Erasmus had a far more important work to do than the writing of elegant Latin. It was his great purpose to deliver the minds of men from the bondage of superstition and dogmatism, to bring in the reign of culture and liberality, of a simpler and purer Christianity. The multitude of books and pamphlets which came from his pen, and were sent forth from Froben's press at Basel, contributed not a little to the realizing of this purpose. They also did much to prepare the way for the religious revolution which broke out long before the work of Erasmus was over, and some of whose tendencies he could not but view with anxiety and repugnance. His relations to Luther and to the Protestant cause will be spoken of in the history of the next period.

THE MODERN ERA.

PERIOD VIII.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE REFORMATION
TO THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA (1517-1648).

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF PROTESTANTISM: THE CON-
FLICT OF RELIGIOUS PARTIES.

CHAPTER I.

THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY, FROM THE POSTING OF LU-
THER'S THESES TO THE DIET OF AUGSBURG (1517-1530).

THE Reformation, like all other great social convulsions, was long in preparation. It was one part of that general progress, complex in its character, which marked the fifteenth century and the opening of the sixteenth as the period of transition from the Middle Ages to modern civilization. The glory of the Holy Empire had long since departed. The papacy, its counterpart in the mediæval commonwealth, had sunk almost to the level of an Italian principality. In the meantime, all the nations of the West were becoming consolidated. A European state-system was growing up. It is a significant fact that in the fifteenth century resident embassies were established at the different courts. The invention of gunpowder revolutionized the art of war, making the serf in combat equal to the noble. While this invention thus enabled monarchs, by means of peasant armies, to destroy the remaining power of the feudal nobility, it also placed in the hands of the people an instrument wherewith to check the tyranny of kings. In this period, likewise, the masterpieces of ancient sculpture and the literary treasures of antiquity were brought forth from their tombs. The writings of Greek and Roman philosophers, orators, and poets, were diffused far and wide by the newly invented art of printing with

movable types. The minds of men were quickened to a new intellectual life. There arose masters in literature, like Erasmus; in painting and sculpture, like Raphael and Michael Angelo. This was also the era of brilliant discoveries. Columbus, with the aid of the magnetic compass, then coming into general use, lifted the veil which had hung across the Western horizon, and disclosed to the people of Europe another hemisphere. Vasco da Gama sailed around the Cape of Good Hope, and, by thus opening a new highway for trade to the East Indies, struck a fatal blow at the commercial supremacy of Genoa and Venice, and laid the foundation of the maritime power of the nations of Western Europe.

But while the Reformation was one part of a change extending over the whole sphere of human knowledge and activity, it had its own specific origin and significance. These are still, to some extent, a subject of controversy. It is true that astrology is an extinct science, so that men no longer refer the Reformation, as some did at that day, "to a certain uncommon and malignant position of the stars, which scattered the spirit of giddiness and innovation over the world." But there remains a diversity of theories on the subject. The French historian Guizot and numerous other writers have described it as, in its real meaning, an insurrection against priestly authority. It is called an uprising of the human intellect to break the bonds which had been imposed upon free thought. Guizot distinguishes between the conscious purpose of the Reformers and the actual drift and final effect of their work. There is no doubt that, as regards liberty, they "builted better than they knew." Yet the true glory of the Reformation is not increased by making it, in its origin and essential nature, anything save a movement in the cause of religion, and instigated by deep religious convictions. Roman Catholic writers find in the Protestant movement the prolific source of infidelity and atheism. Rationalists applaud it as the first step towards the emancipation of human reason from the reign of tradition and dogma. Time was required, they both affirm, to develop its inherent tendencies. But whatever dangers may attend freedom of thought in matters of religion, skepticism is certainly no more the fruit of such liberty than of the yoke laid upon the intellect by the mediæval system. The Reformers themselves were confident that their work arrested the progress of unbelief and saved the religion of Europe. With the Renaissance there came in a great amount of latent skepticism. Melancthon affirmed that Luther's movement prevented far greater disturbances—*longe graviores tumultus*—from the spread of infidel-

ity. It cannot be denied that Protestantism brought a revival of religious feeling among those who accepted it, and resulted, by a reactionary influence, in an awakening of religious zeal within the Catholic body itself.

The Reformation, whatever may have been its occult tendencies, was a movement in the sphere of religion. One of its causes, as well as one of the sources of its great power, was the increasing discontent with the prevailing corruption and misgovernment in the Church, and with papal interference in civil affairs. As far back as 1431, Cardinal Julian Cesarini, who presided as papal legate at Basel, wrote to Pope Eugene IV. that, unless there could be a reform, there would be a great uprising of the laity for the overthrow of a corrupt clergy, and that a heresy would arise more formidable than that of the Bohemians. The misconduct of the popes in the last half of the fifteenth century was not more flagrant than that of their predecessors in the tenth century. But the fifteenth century was an age of light. What was done by the pontiffs was not done in a corner, but under the eyes of all Europe. Besides, there was now a deep-seated craving, especially in the Teutonic peoples, who had so long been under the tutelage of a legal, judaizing form of Christianity, for a more spiritual type of religion. The freer spirit of the gospel, which was kept alive in their hearts, gradually acquired strength sufficient to break down the barrier, which a vast institution had placed in the way of a direct access to God. It was not a zeal to destroy which subverted the older beliefs, but the expulsive power of deeper convictions and of a purer apprehension of the truth. The Reformation did not attempt to build up a new religion, but to reform the old, according to its own authoritative standards. It was distinctively Christian, because it found its source and regulative principles in the Scriptures.

Yet the Reformers, in maintaining that authority resided not in the Church but in the Bible, exercised the right of private judgment. In so doing they laid the foundation of that intellectual liberty, that freedom of thought and inquiry, which coming generations were to enjoy.

While it is necessary to keep in mind the real origin and significance of the Reformation, as well as the place which it occupied in the general course of history, it is important not to lose sight of the agency of the leaders by whose personal qualities it was to a large extent produced and moulded. If a revolution in long-established opinions and habits of feeling is to take

place, there must be individuals who have caught glimpses of some great but obscured truth, who have realized its value in their own experience, can interpret it to their fellow-men, and can create and sustain in them the new moral life.

The Reformation may be viewed in two aspects. On the one hand it is a religious revolution affecting the beliefs, the rites, the ecclesiastical organization of the Church, and the form of Christian life. On the other hand, it is a great movement in which sovereigns and nations are involved ; the occasion of wars and treaties ; the close of an old, and the introduction of a new, period in the history of culture and civilization.

Two aspects
of the Refor-
mation.

Germany, including the Netherlands and Switzerland, was the stronghold of the Reformation. It was natural that such a movement should spring up and rise to its highest power among a people in whom a love of independence was mingled with a yearning for a more spiritual form of religion than was encouraged by mediæval ecclesiasticism. Hegel has dwelt with eloquence upon the fact that while the rest of the world was gone out to America or to the Indies, in quest of riches and of a dominion that should encircle the globe, a simple monk, turning away from empty forms and the things of sense, was finding him whom the disciples once sought in a sepulchre of stone.

It begins in
Germany.

Unquestionably the hero of the Reformation was Martin Luther. His dauntless determination was the rallying-point for multitudes not able of themselves to begin a work involving so arduous a conflict with misgivings within and foes without. The trumpet which he put to his lips resounded afar. It was heard among the mountains of Switzerland ; it roused kindred spirits in all the Teutonic lands ; and even awoke responsive voices of sympathy in the Southern nations of Europe. Without Luther and his powerful influence, other reformatory efforts, even such as had an independent beginning, like that of Zwingli, might have led to no enduring results. As an English writer has pointed out, Luther's whole nature was identified with his great work, and while other leaders, like Melancthon and even Calvin, can be separated in thought from the Reformation, "Luther, apart from the Reformation, would cease to be Luther."

Luther.

He was the son of a plain miner, and was born at Eisleben on the 10th of November, 1483. His parents were quite poor, but they were self-respecting, and set a proper value on intellectual and religious training. Having passed through the severe but well-meant discipline of his humble home, and, in

His early life.

conformity with a custom of the times, sung at the doors of the citizens of Eisenach to pay for his schooling there, he went to Erfurt to complete his studies before entering the legal profession. There deep religious anxieties in his soul were increased by the reading of a copy of the Scriptures which he one day met with. Familiar as he was with the portions of the Bible read in the church services, the entire volume, strange to say, he had not before taken in his hands. Two years later, against his father's will, he forsook the legal profession and entered an Augustinian convent. In 1508 he was made preacher at Wittenberg and professor in the university which had recently been founded by the Elector of Saxony, Frederick the Wise. There he soon became distinguished for his learning and for his devotion to the Scriptures.

Luther, notwithstanding his genial and joyous nature, was not without a deep vein of reflection which tended even to melancholy. His earlier religious life had been full of anxiety and fears of conscience. He had been taught to look upon Christ as a law-giver who would "at the last day demand how we had atoned for our guilt, and how many good works we had done." The wise counsels of John Staupitz, the vicar-general of his order, and his own study of Augustine and of Tauler, opened to him glimpses of the purer doctrine of the gospel. But it was only after pondering the words in the Epistle to the Romans, "the just shall live by faith," that the truth flashed upon him. It was then that he realized that Christ came, not as a law-giver, but as a Saviour; that by his union with mankind he takes on his heart the whole burden that rests upon us, and by our union with him all that is his becomes ours; that faith lifts the believer out of the legal into the filial relation, and brings him into immediate union with God. Good works are then the fruit of faith, a spontaneous and necessary product. Thenceforth the writings of Paul, and especially the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, were his constant companions. The latter he styled, in his humorous way, his wife, his Catharine von Bora.

Luther had not then thought of any antagonism in his new position to the rites and ordinances of the Church, and to the principle of Church authority. It was subsequent events which gradually revealed this to him. In 1517 John Tetzel, a hawker of indulgences, the proceeds of which were to help pay for the building of St. Peter's Church, appeared in the neighborhood of Wittenberg. To persuade the people to buy his spiritual wares, he told them, as Luther himself testifies, that as

His religious
experience.

He opposes
Tetzel.

soon as their money clinked in the bottom of the chest the souls of their deceased friends forthwith went up to heaven. Luther was so struck with the enormity of this traffic that he determined to stop it. He preached against it, and on October 31, 1517, he posted on the door of the Church of All Saints, at Wittenberg, his ninety-five theses, relating to the doctrine and practice of selling indulgences.

Indulgences, as we have already explained, were at first commutations of penance by the payment of money. The right to issue them had gradually become the exclusive prerogative of the popes. The eternal punishment of mortal sin being remitted or commuted by the absolution of the priest, it was open to the pope or his agents, by a grant of indulgences, to remove the temporal or terminable penalties, which might extend into purgatory. For the benefit of the needy he could draw upon the treasury of merit stored up by Christ and the saints. Although it was expressly declared by Pope Sixtus IV., that souls are delivered from purgatorial fires in a way analogous to the efficacy of prayer, and although contrition was theoretically required of the recipient of an indulgence, it often appeared to the people as a simple bargain, according to which, on payment of a stipulated sum, the individual obtained a full discharge from the penalties of sin, or procured the release of a soul from the flames.

Luther's theses assailed the doctrines which made this baneful traffic possible. They denied the power of the pope to remove any penalties other than those he had himself imposed, and affirmed that these do not reach beyond death. The right to issue indulgences in this restricted form, they maintained, belongs to pastors and bishops not less than to the pope. The theses were an attack on the theory of indulgences which Thomas Aquinas had built up. But they were much more than this. Unconsciously to their author, they struck a blow at the authority of Rome and of the priesthood. Luther had no thought of throwing off his allegiance to the Roman Church. Even his theses were only propositions, propounded for academic debate, according to the custom in mediæval universities. He concluded them with the solemn declaration that he affirmed nothing, but left all to the judgment of the Church. Could he have been allowed by the ecclesiastical powers to hold and to preach the gospel, which had wrought itself so completely into his experience, he would have continued a loyal subject, without any scrutiny of the foundations of the sway under which he had grown up. It was only by degrees that he

Doctrine of
the theses.

came to perceive how groundless were the papal pretensions, and how incompatible the traditional theory of Church authority was with his interpretation of the gospel. "Oh!" he exclaims, "with what anxiety and labor, with what searching of the Scriptures, have I justified myself, in conscience, in standing up alone against the pope?" Such reflections, natural to an ingenuous mind, on the apparent audacity of such a revolt, occasionally occurred to him when he was in the midst of his career, and have been falsely styled, even by recent polemical writers, fits of remorse.

The theses stirred up a commotion all over Germany. The life-long antagonists of monkish superstition, Reuchlin and Erasmus, rejoiced at the boldness of Luther. "No one," says Luther, "would bell the cats; for the heresy-masters of the preaching order [the Dominicans] had driven all the world to terror by their fires." The emperor, Maximilian, whose political hopes had often been thwarted by the pope, said to the elector, "Let the Wittenberg monk be taken good care of; we may some day want him." A controversy arose between the new champion of reform and the defenders of indulgences. It was during this dispute that Luther began to realize that human authority was against him and to see the necessity of planting himself more distinctly on the Scriptures. His clear arguments and resolute attitude won the respect of the Elector of Saxony, who, though he often sought to restrain his vehemence, nevertheless protected him from his enemies. This the elector was able to do because of his political importance, which became still greater when, after the death of Maximilian, he was made regent of Northern Germany.

The pope, Leo X., when he first heard of the commotion in Saxony, pronounced it a squabble of monks. He made an ineffectual attempt, through his legate, Cajetan, to reduce Luther to submission. The wary and accomplished Italian, liberal minded, too, as he proved himself in his subsequent career, found the monk whom he met at Augsburg and whom he expected to convert, much more ready to debate than to be instructed. Leo then issued a bull reaffirming the doctrine of indulgences. Thereupon the Saxon reformer appealed from the pope to a general council. A second messenger from the papal court, Miltitz, a Saxon by birth, an ecclesiastic who was conciliatory in manner, would perhaps have met with better success had not Luther been in a manner forced by Dr. John Eck, one of his theological opponents, into a public disputation at Leipsic. Eck had arranged for a debate with Carlstadt, one of

Effect of the theses.

October 7,
1518.

December,
1518.

Disputation
at Leipsic,
1519.

Luther's colleagues, but he made his theses an attack on the doctrine of Luther. To Leipsic Luther went, attended by the new professor of Greek at Wittenberg, Philip Melanchthon, a young man of twenty-two, who was already distinguished for his attainments. Although Melanchthon was quite the opposite of Luther in temperament, he soon proved himself a valuable auxiliary. He had a fine but cautious intellect, and exact and ample learning. He won fame alike as a theologian and an expositor. His commentary on the Epistle to the Romans laid the foundation of Protestant exegesis. It was only after Eck and Carlstadt had been arguing several days on the difficult themes of grace and free-will that Luther joined in the discussion. Not even at such a moment did he fail to show his delight in nature. As he ascended the platform he carried in his hand a nosegay of flowers. He was then in his thirty-sixth year, of middle stature, at that time thin, and spoke in a clear, melodious voice. This disputation before Duke George of Saxony, who became a decided enemy of the Reformation, proved to be the turning-point in Luther's career. He was drawn by his opponent into a discussion of the primacy of the pope, in the course of which he declared it to be of human appointment and therefore not indispensable. In answer to a question, he startled the assembly, and provoked an angry exclamation from the Duke, by asserting that among the articles for which Huss was condemned at Constance, there were some that were thoroughly Christian.

As the controversy continued, Luther's studies led him more and more to regard the papal rule as a hateful usurpation. He found it vain to appeal to the rulers of the church for reform, and he now turned to the people. In his spirited "Address to the Christian Nobles of the German Nation," he urged them to put an end to the tyrannical interference of the pope in civil affairs, and to take the work of reformation into their own hands. He rejected the idea of a special priesthood, and emphatically asserted the universal priesthood of believers, and with it their right to choose those who should be "ministers of their common power." This was followed by a treatise on the "Babylonian Captivity of the Church," in which he attacked transubstantiation as well as the ordinances which violated Christian liberty by prescribing pilgrimages, fastings, and monasticism. It was not long before a papal bull was sent to Germany, excommunicating Luther and commanding the Elector Frederic to deliver him up. But the elector, having first sought the advice of Erasmus, chose rather to protect

"Address to the Nobles," and "Babylonian Captivity."

Bull of excommunication, June 15, 1520.

him. Erasmus remarked to Frederic: "Luther has sinned in two points. He has hit the pope's crown and the bellies of the monks." Meanwhile Luther was not silent. He called the papal decree the "execrable bull of Antichrist." On the 10th of December, 1520, he burned it, together with a copy of the canon law, at the gates of Wittenberg, in the presence of the doctors and students of the university and of a concourse of people who gathered to witness the scene. By this act he threw off his allegiance to the Roman church. He was thenceforth a declared enemy of the mediæval system. Luther had many friends and sympathizers besides the great elector. The jurists were ready to defend him, for they saw in the papal bull only a fresh instance of the interference of ecclesiastical powers with civil jurisdiction. Many of the inferior clergy and of the monastic orders were attracted to the new doctrine, which based itself, not on the dogmas and ordinances of men, but upon the word of God. The older Humanists approved of Luther's brave attack on the abuses of the age, but deprecated his vehemence. Not so the young men of whom Ulrich von Hutten was the leader. He entered with the same wild zeal into the cause of the Wittenberg reformers that he had shown before in the defence of Reuchlin against the Dominican obscurantists. He scattered broadcast stormy invectives against the pope and his agents. He appealed to the Germans to deliver themselves from their slavery to Rome. His fiery harangues were all the more effective because they were written in verse, in the language of the people. Hutten's friend, Francis von Sickingen, a knight who was ever ready for a bold exploit, offered Luther a refuge, in case of need, in his strong castle of Ebernburg.

Germany was thus on the eve of a great religious movement. The political condition of the country seemed, however, to portend Condition of Germany. not reform but revolution. The Italian wars of Frederic II. and the anarchy which followed his downfall, fatally weakened the authority of the imperial government. The Golden Bull of Charles IV., in 1356, left the preponderance of power in the hands of the seven leading princes, three archbishops and four nobles, to whom the choice of the emperor was committed. But the intestine strife between the different states did not cease. The efforts of the emperor Maximilian to dispense an equal justice and to put an end to private war were in the main unsuccessful. The quarrels of the princes with the bishops, as well as with the knights, became still more frequent. The cities complained of the tyranny of the imperial government and of the depredations of lawless

nobles. They murmured at the burdensome taxes and at the insecurity of the highways. The peasants, goaded almost to despair by the hardships of their condition, were ready to raise the standard of revolt. On the death of Maximilian (January 12, 1519), the

Election of
Charles V.,
June 28, 1519.

imperial crown was offered to the Elector Frederic. His refusal to accept an office which required for its vigorous administration resources greater than he possessed, left two principal aspirants for the succession, Francis I., king of France, and Charles, the young king of Spain. Charles was the grandson of the emperor Maximilian and of Ferdinand the Catholic. He had thus inherited Austria and the Low Countries, the crowns of Castile and Aragon, of Navarre, of Naples and Sicily, together with the Spanish territories in America. The electors were anxious to preserve their own prerogatives, and at the same time to secure for the empire a powerful defender against the Turks. They therefore passed by the brilliant but despotic Francis, and fixed upon Charles, whose mild temper and great hereditary dominions seemed better to suit their aims. But they first bound him by a "capitulation" to respect the rights of the Diet, and not to bring foreign troops into the country. The election of Charles did not prove an unmixed advantage to Germany. Although he was a sagacious statesman, he was unfitted, both by his education and by his position, to become the leader of a people who were filled with aspirations after national unity and reform. The object of his life was not so much to further the peculiar interests of Germany, which was but one part of his great realm, as to extend his dominions and strengthen his imperial authority. His idea that, as emperor, he was the temporal ruler of the Christian commonwealth of which the spiritual head was the pope, necessarily made him an antagonist of the Protestant movement. And yet his attitude towards it was actually governed by no consistent plan, but was dictated by the changing circumstances of the political situation. The interests of his vast dominions often compelled him to suffer the reformers to remain undisturbed. He was frequently in conflict with the French king and sometimes with the pope, both of whom were alarmed at the concentration of so much power in the hands of a single monarch. Charles, Francis, and the pope each sought to win an advantage over the others, and to each at one time or another the Lutherans were useful allies. Moreover, Christendom was continually threatened by the Turks, and the emperor could ill afford, in the face of so dangerous an invader, to alienate a large part of the German population.

The first political combination seemed unfavorable to the cause of Luther. Leo X. had opposed the election of Charles V., fearing to have the States of the Church surrounded by the imperial territories. This did not prevent him, however, from entering into friendly negotiations with Charles as soon as he had become emperor. He urged him to put Luther, who was already cut off from the communion of the Church, under the ban of the empire. This Charles proposed to do by an imperial edict at the Diet of Worms. But the German princes, not unmindful of the many encroachments of the court of Rome, and of the reformer's manly denunciation of its extortions and tyranny, persuaded the emperor not to condemn him unheard. Luther was, therefore, summoned before the Diet to answer for himself. All along the way to the city of Worms he was greeted with enthusiasm. At Erfurt, the university went out in a procession to meet him, and welcomed him with a speech from the rector. There were occasionally voices which warned him not to trust in the emperor's safe-conduct. To one of the councillors of the elector, who reminded him of the fate of Huss, he replied: "Huss has been burned, but not the truth with him. I will go on, though as many devils were aiming at me as there are tiles on the roof."

April 17.

When he appeared before the Diet the hall was filled with a great assembly of princes and nobles. The young emperor was seated on his throne. Near him was his brother, the Archduke Ferdinand. Among the magnates present were the Elector of Saxony, and Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse. When first introduced, clad in his monk's frock, into the presence of this august body, Luther appeared a little dazed, spoke in a low tone, and when questioned whether he would retract the contents of his books, he asked—no doubt, as directed by his legal adviser—for time to frame a reply. It was a question not to be answered by a simple "yes" or "no." There was much in his books to which no one could object, and some things, especially in regard to persons, which he might not himself approve. On the following day, he declared to the Diet that he could not retract anything that he had written until it was proved contrary to Scripture or right reason. When asked finally whether he would recant, he replied that his conscience would not permit him, and, according to an early and trustworthy tradition, closed with the words: "Here I stand; I can do naught else. God help me. Amen." There were some who urged Charles to arrest Luther on the ground that faith is not to be kept with heretics. Such solicitations only kindled the anger of the Ger-

man princes. There were others besides the Elector Frederic who were ready to defend the brave monk. Daring knights like Ulrich von Hutten signified to members of the Diet that vengeance would follow in case he was harmed. While Luther was on his way back to

Wittenberg he was intercepted by soldiers of the elector
April 28.

and was carried off to a safe retreat in the castle of the Wartburg. The elector had previously informed him of his scheme, but it was supposed at first that his enemies had made way with him. Albert Dürer, then at Antwerp, recorded in his diary his poignant grief over so great a loss to the Church. The Diet had already begun to disperse when, on May 26th, an edict placing Luther under the ban of the empire was, through the intrigues of Aleander, the papal nuncio, hastily passed. Bearing the same date was a treaty between Charles V. and Leo X. for the reconquest of Milan from the French.

Charles laid claim to Lombardy as one of the territories of the empire. But Francis was resolved to hold the lands which he had won at Marignano, and, in addition, to vindicate the rights of the house of Anjou over Naples. His army, however, was soon driven out of Lombardy by the emperor, and Francesco Sforza, second son of the old duke, was established in Milan. The sounds of rejoicing at Rome over the imperial victory had scarcely died away when Leo X. fell sick of a mortal disease.

1521-1522. His successor, Adrian VI., although he had been formerly a tutor of Charles, assumed as long as he was able a neutral attitude towards the warring monarchs. But new dangers drove him to the side of the emperor. The cause of Francis was threatened in another quarter. Charles of Bourbon, the most eminent and the richest man of the kingdom, dissatisfied with the treatment which he had received, went over to the imperial side. Clement VII., however, who was of the house of Medici and was a man of the world, like Leo X., saw that little gain was coming to the papacy out of the Spanish dominion in Italy, and became anxious to put an end to it. He had already espoused the cause of the French when Francis himself, having advanced into Italy at the

1525. head of a brilliant army, was defeated at Pavia and taken prisoner. The king was now in the power of Charles,

and was obliged, in order to obtain his release, to renounce, by the treaty of Madrid, his claims in Italy, as well as over other territories which were in dispute. Had he faithfully carried out the terms of the peace, the Lutherans would have been at the mercy of the emperor. But the very day on which he

Victories of
Charles in
Italy.

January 14,
1526.

pledged his honor to fulfil the treaty, he signed a protest declaring that it was procured by compulsion.

The attention of the emperor had been so absorbed in his Italian wars, and in settling the affairs of Spain, that Germany was left to take care of itself. This was favorable to the

Luther's
translation of
the Bible.

cause of the Reformers. Although Luther was now legally an outlaw, under the condemnation of the Church and of the Empire, institutions which men had been wont to regard as the two governing powers of the world, he was safe as long as he remained in Saxony. The elector, however, thought it prudent for him to stay for a time in the Wartburg. While there he busied himself chiefly with his translation of the New Testament, the first portion of that version of the whole Bible which, aside from its value in the religious education of the people, created an epoch in the history of the German tongue. Familiar from boyhood with the language of common life, he took great pains, nevertheless, to confer with anybody who could give him light as to popular phrases and idioms. The prophets and apostles, cost what effort it might, must be made to talk German. He humorously speaks of how he wrestled to make Job plain to the common reader. Through the fifteenth century, and especially in the latter half of the century, there had existed in Germany a growing desire to have the Scriptures in the vernacular. Besides translations of particular parts, prior to 1518 not less than fourteen editions of the whole Bible had been printed in High German, and four in Low German. But they were substantially the same version; they were small editions, and their circulation was limited. It was Luther who gave the Bible to the people, and in a form so full of vitality that the people were eager to read it.

Meanwhile a grave disturbance had arisen at Wittenberg. Carlstadt had begun to assail all the rites and ordinances of the Church which he deemed inconsistent with the new doctrine.

Disturbances
at Witten-
berg, 1522.

The trouble was increased by certain enthusiasts from Zwickau, who claimed to be immediately inspired, and who prophesied a great social convulsion. Luther saw that the movement which he had inaugurated was in danger of ending in a wild burst of fanaticism. His profound Christian sagacity made him firmly averse to ecclesiastical changes which did not come about naturally, from an insight into the true principles of the gospel. Realizing the importance of the crisis, he was forgetful of his own safety. He refused to listen to the warnings of the elector, who said that he could not protect him from the consequences of

the imperial edict. Having returned to Wittenberg, in a few powerful sermons he inculcated the principles of Christian moderation. When the commotion was subdued, he did not go back to the asylum provided for him, but remained at Wittenberg, laboring unremittingly as a preacher, teacher, and author.

Meanwhile the Council of the Regency, to which the government of Germany had been committed during the absence of the emperor, refused to take any steps towards carrying out the edict promulgated at Worms. They were personally favorable to the movement for reform, and were, moreover, convinced that it had taken so strong a hold upon the minds of the people that to attempt to crush it would provoke a dangerous rebellion. Consequently, when Adrian, who was desirous of doing away with the abuses which had so long afflicted the Church, promised through his legate, at the Diet of Nuremberg, to bring about the needed reforms, and urged upon the diet the fulfilment of the imperial edict, the only answer he received was a list of a hundred grievances which Germany had to allege against the Roman court. But certain events soon took place which injured the cause of the Reformation, and gave rise to a conservative reaction. The knights, aggrieved at the continued encroachments of the imperial princes, banded themselves together under Francis von Sickingen. They sought to ally their movement with the new zeal which had been excited in behalf of a pure gospel. The attack on the Archbishop of Treves, one of the electors, by Sickingen was repulsed, and his death, which occurred soon after, brought the revolt to an end. Luther had repeatedly striven to dissuade the knights from warlike measures, but the cause of reform suffered from the attempt of men who had supported it to bring about a civil revolution. Nevertheless, Campeggio, the legate of Clement VII., at the diet which was held at Nuremberg in 1524, was able to obtain only an indefinite promise to observe the Worms decree "as far as possible." By this action the matter was practically given over to the several princes, who could adopt whatever policy they chose within their own territories—an important step in the progress of the Reformation. But Campeggio succeeded better in his second project. Through his influence the Archduke of Austria and the Catholic princes and bishops of South Germany formed an alliance at Ratisbon, by the terms of which the Wittenberg heresy was to be excluded from their dominions, and they were to help each other in their common dangers. Thus the nation, which had hitherto been one in its aspirations after reform,

Diet of Nuremberg,
1522.

Catholic
alliance.

as well as in its refusal to suppress the new opinions, was separating into two hostile parties.

At this time there occurred a social convulsion which, even more than the War of the Knights, caused men to look with alarm on the work of the reformers. It was the revolt of the peasants, which broke out in 1524, and became general in the following year. They had long suffered under the heavy burdens laid upon them by the nobles and the clergy. More than once they had risen in rebellion. Their discontent, their sense of the wrongs done them, was fomented by the spread among them of the Lutheran doctrine of Christian liberty. They were still further inflamed by the harangues of revolutionary preachers, one of whom, Carlstadt, had caused so much trouble at Wittenberg. The revolt began in Swabia. The peasants embodied their grievances in twelve articles. Many of their demands were just, and were supported, as they thought, by plain words of Scripture. They maintained that those whom Christ had redeemed should no longer endure the bondage of serfdom. They demanded freedom in Church affairs, a restoration of the rights of the community over the woods and commons, and the abolition of other forms of feudal tyranny. But as the rebellion spread into Thuringia, under the influence of a fanatical leader, Thomas Münzer, it threatened the overthrow of civil authority. The peasants looked to Luther for sympathy and support. But although he recognized the bitterness of their condition and was ready to intercede in their behalf, he was firmly opposed to all resort to force. When the peasants finally rose in rebellion, he urged the princes to cut them down without mercy. The nobles were only too willing to carry out literally the counsels of the reformer. Great numbers of the peasants were slain, and several of their leaders were cruelly punished. Luther's uncompromising support of the civil authority prevented so strong a reaction as such disorders might have brought about, to the detriment of the cause of the Reformation. A few days before the revolt came to an end, the Elector Frederic died. He was succeeded by his brother John, called the Steadfast, who proved an equally staunch defender of the Lutheran reform.

It is necessary here to turn aside from the general course of events, in order to describe certain occurrences which, though they had an important influence on the course of the Reformation, are especially interesting as illustrating the personal character of Luther. On June 13th of this same year (1525) Luther married Catharine von Bora, who had formerly

Luther's marriage and domestic life.

been a nun of the Cistercian order. He took this step, which dismayed even some of his best friends, partly as a practical testimony against the ecclesiastical law of celibacy, and partly because he yearned after the happiness of domestic life. It proved, in the long run, of advantage to his cause. It gave him a home where, when wearied by the intense excitement and incessant toil of his busy life, he could delight in music and song, and in the frolics of his children. His diverting letters to his wife—his “Mistress Kate,” “Doctress Luther,” as he styled her—and the tender expressions of his grief at the death of his children, reveal to us a side of his nature the knowledge of which could ill be spared.

During the years which had passed since the Diet of Worms, Luther was engaged in translating the Bible, and in composing catechisms, sermons, tracts, and other writings, for the building up of the Church. In conjunction with these prodigious labors, he took part in many controversies, the most important of which were those with Henry VIII. and Erasmus. The vehemence of the reformer's temper often moved him to use the roughest style of vituperation. On this score, however, there is much to be said in his defence. He was the object of violent antipathy. Then he felt that his warfare must be without compromise. To flinch would be to surrender. The disease was one which could not be cured by a palliative. Moreover, he was convinced that he beheld in the mediæval system the same pharisaical theology and ethics which had called forth unsparing denunciations from Paul and from Christ himself. Yet it must be allowed that in Luther, along with deep tenderness of feeling and poetic sensibility, there was a coarser vein. There was a plebeian rudeness, which, when he was goaded by opposition, found vent in abusive, and even scurrilous, language. Henry VIII. wrote, in 1521, a book against Luther's work on the sacraments, “The Babylonian Captivity.” It was a haughty and severe attack on the reformer for setting himself up against the authority of popes and doctors without number. It won for Henry, from Leo X., the title, of Defender of the Faith, a title which was retained by Henry after his breach with the Roman see, and which has been ever since worn by his successors. In his reply Luther did not hesitate to bemoan the royal purple, seeking, perhaps, to dispel the prestige which the arguments of one of the foremost princes of Europe would naturally have in the arena of theological debate. The ungenerous use by Henry of an apology which Luther sent him, at

Luther's controversy with Henry VIII.

a time when he was reputed to be turning in favor of the Protestant cause, confirmed the Saxon reformer in the opinion that all such humility was thrown away.

The enmity which gradually sprang up between the Saxon theologians and Erasmus was unfortunate. They who loved learning and hated superstition could not but look with respect upon this patriarch of letters, this keen antagonist of the monks. Nor could Erasmus avoid sympathizing with their courageous advocacy of principles the most of which he himself approved. But he was not the man to rebel against constituted authority for the sake of his convictions. He felt, moreover, that peace was all-important for the advancement of the culture and learning to which his life was devoted. He bewailed the fact that men's minds were being turned away from literature, and were becoming absorbed in theological controversy. Luther's roughness became more and more distasteful to him. Moreover, while he sought to avoid giving offence to the reformers, he was anxious to remain on good terms with the rulers of the Church, many of whom were his patrons. Luther saw through him, and too plainly showed his contempt for what could only appear to him a cowardly and a time-serving policy. The refusal of Erasmus to see Ulrich von Hutten, who called upon him at Basel, was the first decided step in the estrangement of the great scholar from the apostle of reform. At length, yielding to the persuasions of his Catholic friends, the chief of the Humanists ventured to assail Luther's position on the subject of free-will, a point where the reformer's extravagant language made him especially vulnerable. Erasmus and his associates preferred the Greek theology, while Luther, as More once said, "clung by tooth and nail to the doctrine of Augustine." The book of Erasmus called forth a reply from Luther in his severest style. He thought Erasmus was defending the principles which lay at the basis of the whole system of salvation by merit. The controversy which ensued completed their alienation. Luther afterward spoke of the illustrious Humanist as a disciple of Lucian, of Epicurus, as an enemy of all religions, especially of the Christian. Such treatment only served to exasperate Erasmus, and to make him more distinctly an adversary of the Protestants. Luther, although he was drawn by his usual ardor into erroneous and uncharitable assertions, was right in believing that diverting satires on the follies of the monks could never reform the Church. To accomplish this work it was necessary to attack the wrong foundations upon which the whole system, of which monasticism was a branch, rested. The

Luther and
Erasmus.

rising zeal of the papal party must be confronted by an equally uncompromising energy. Without the sterner contest waged by Luther, the literary reformers must eventually have succumbed to the terrors of the Inquisition. But Erasmus belonged to the age of preparation. The splendid work that he did then must not be disparaged on account of his shortcomings in later life. How diverse the two men were in their natural qualities is indicated by their portraits. The fine, sharply cut features of Erasmus, as depicted by Holbein, show us the critic, whose weapon in conflict is the keen edged rapier. The rugged face of Luther, as seen on the canvas of Cranach, befits one who has been called "the modern Hercules," who cleansed the Augean stables, and who carried into battle the club of his fabled prototype.

At the time (1526) when this controversy between Luther and Erasmus was drawing to an end, the cause of the reformers was threatened by many dangers. The hostile attitude which the emperor assumed during the latter part of his war with Francis, and his resolve, after the Treaty of Madrid, to suppress the Lutheran heresy, caused the princes who were favorable to re-
 League of Torgau, form to unite in the League of Torgau. Again the Reformation was protected by the political schemes of the European powers. Clement VII. made an alliance with Francis, Venice, and the Duke of Milan, to check the growing power of the emperor. Consequently, Charles was obliged to reverse his policy in respect to the Lutherans. At the Diet of Spire a decree was promulgated according to which every state was to act, with reference to the edict of Worms, as it might answer to God and his imperial majesty. This act gave the Lutheran movement a legal existence. It is, therefore, a great landmark in the history of the German Reformation. But the emperor was soon triumphant over all his enemies. Rome was stormed, the pope was a prisoner, the armies of the French were destroyed. The Italian victories of Charles and his subsequent treaty with the pope emboldened the Catholic party, which was in the majority at the Diet of Spire, in 1529, The Protest, to proclaim an edict which forbade the progress of the Reformation in the states which had not accepted it, while granting full liberty in the reformed states to such as adhered to the Church of Rome. The protest which the Elector of Saxony and several other princes, together with fourteen cities, made against the decree, gave the name PROTESTANT to the Lutheran party. They declared that the new edict was contrary to a policy which had been solemnly established ; a policy on the faith of which the princes and cities

that were favorable to the evangelical cause had proceeded in shaping their religious polity and worship.

Meanwhile a violent controversy had broken out between Luther and the Swiss reformers on the subject of the sacrament. An attempt was made at Marburg, in 1529, by a conference of the representatives of both parties, to heal the threatened rupture, but it met with no success. At a time when the enemies of the Reformation were strongest, its friends were hopelessly divided. If Luther confined ecclesiastical fellowship within too narrow bounds, yet in his defence of what he believed to be the truth he always showed a noble disregard of mere expediency. The emperor was now free to attend to the affairs of Germany. The conflict with Francis had been ended by the Peace of Cambrai; the formidable attack of the Turks upon Vienna had been repulsed. Charles came to the Diet of Augsburg

Sacramental
controversy.

Diet of Augs-
burg, 1530.

filled with the sense of his responsibility as head of the Holy Roman empire, whose crown he had just received from the hands of the pope at Bologna. He was determined to restore the unity of the Church. But the Protestants were equally resolved to maintain the cause of the Reformation. They presented their celebrated "Confession"—drawn up by Melanchthon—which, though conciliatory in spirit, clearly defined the essential tenets of the reformers. An attempt was made through committees of theologians taken from each party to arrange a compromise. But these negotiations were unsuccessful, much to the joy of Luther, who did not believe in the possibility of agreement between the respective parties in matters of doctrine. It had not been thought safe for Luther to go to Augsburg, and therefore he was left behind at the castle of Coburg, within the dominion of the elector. He was, however, in constant communication with the Saxon theologians at Augsburg, and knew of all that was done at the Diet. His letters, with a fine mingling of jest and earnest, exhort his friends to a firmer confidence in God's care for the cause of right. They breathe the same sublime spirit which rings out in the most popular of his hymns, "Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott." The diet decreed the restoration of the old ecclesiastical institutions, and threatened to resort to forcible measures should the Protestants not submit. But the friends of the Reformation remained steadfast. The Elector John, in the full prospect of the ruin of every earthly interest, and not without the deepest sensibility from his attachment to the emperor and to the peace of the empire, resolved to stand by "the imperishable Word of God." The Protestant princes, together with

certain imperial cities of South Germany, united in the League of Smalcald to resist the arbitrary proceedings of the emperor in his efforts to crush out the new opinions. Luther, who had hitherto opposed a resort to arms, now declared that Christians were bound to defend their princes when unlawfully assaulted. The league strengthened itself by an alliance with France, Denmark, and the Dukes of Bavaria. The territories of the emperor were again threatened by an irruption of the Turks under Soliman. Under these circumstances, it was impossible to carry out the measures of repression which had been resolved upon at Augsburg. Accordingly, the peace of Nuremberg was concluded in 1532, which provided that religious affairs should be left as they were until they could be arranged by a new diet or a general council.

CHAPTER II.

THE REFORMATION IN SWITZERLAND ; IN SCANDINAVIAN AND SLAVONIAN COUNTRIES, AND IN HUNGARY : THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY UNTIL THE PEACE OF AUGSBURG (1555).

DURING the years which elapsed between the posting of Luther's theses and the peace of Nuremberg a reformatory movement, of a type somewhat peculiar, was in progress in the most populous cantons of Switzerland. Not only were the doctrines and rites of the Church recast, but the social and political life of the Swiss communities affected by the reform was purified and elevated. This change was due, for the most part, to the plastic influence of one man,

Zwingli. Ulrich Zwingli. Zwingli was born in the year 1484 in the mountain-village of Wildhaus, of which his father was the principal magistrate. He was bright-minded, and eager in pursuit of knowledge. Like Luther, he was fond of music. He first studied at the University of Vienna and then went to Basel. At this centre of humanistic culture he acquired that love for the classics which he carried with him to his first parish at Glarus. When the Greek Testament was published by Erasmus he became an earnest student of it, and copied with his own hand the epistles of Paul, that he might have them in a portable volume and commit them to memory. The more he studied the Bible the more inclined he was to defer to its authority. But Zwingli was a patriot as well as a scholar. He saw that the political and social life of his

country was endangered by the system of mercenary service in armies, which was then in vogue. Bribes, pensions, and ecclesiastical preferments were lavished on influential men that the hardy Swiss might fight the battles of the pope or of the French king. Thus the love of country was weakened, reverence for the rulers of the Church was dispelled, and the morals of the people were corrupted by the vices and lawless spirit which the soldiers brought back from their campaigns. Zwingli still regarded the pope as the head of the Church, and therefore did not denounce enlistments for his service. For a time he even accepted a papal pension. But he so vigorously attacked the military alliance made with Francis I. at Freiburg, after the battle of Marignano, that he was forced to leave Glarus. While he was living at Einsiedeln he preached against one Samson, a vender of indulgences, and put an end to his demoralizing traffic. In 1518, largely through the influence of the leading opponents of the French party, Zwingli was trans-

ferred to the cathedral church of Zurich. He now refused longer to receive the papal pension, and declared against all foreign entanglements from whatever quarter they might come. "It is well for the Cardinal of Sitten," he said, "to wear a red hat and cloak; you have only to wring them to behold the blood of your nearest kinsmen dripping from them." He recognized that the root of these civil abuses, as well as of the social calamities which flowed from them, was selfishness. For this evil the only remedy was the Word of God. It was Zwingli's increasing reverence for the power and authority of the Scriptures that made him the leader of a quiet but thorough-going religious revolution. His personal qualities fitted him for such a post. He was an industrious student, and yet fond of the society of his fellow-citizens. He was upright, fearless, and a preacher who thrilled his auditors. One of his hearers said that it seemed to him that Zwingli, when he spoke from the pulpit, held him by the hair of his head. He had not been in Zurich long before he obtained permission from the town council for the priests to preach only what they found in the Scriptures. In 1523, at a public disputation, even though he brought forward sixty-seven propositions which assailed all the peculiar characteristics of the Roman Catholic system, he successfully defended himself against the charge of heresy, and procured from the council a decree that the clergy should teach nothing which the Scriptures do not warrant. In the same year he obtained another decree forbidding the use of images and the sacrifice of the mass. Zwingli did not seek to preserve, as did

Zwingli at
Zurich.

Luther, who had a far deeper reverence for the past, those rites and ceremonies of the mediæval Church which the Bible did not prohibit. Whatever seemed to him allied to superstition he discarded without hesitation. In all these changes, sweeping as they were, everything was done in an orderly manner and by public authority. Zurich now threw off its allegiance to the Bishop of Constance. At the head of the independent church which was thus formed stood the members of the town council, who, according to Zwingli, were the proper representatives of the body of the congregation. In a few short years the religious institutions of Zurich underwent a complete change. All the distinguishing features of the mediæval Church disappeared. The rule of celibacy was abolished. Zwingli himself was married in 1524. The religious revolution was accompanied by an elevation of the moral life of the community. In 1525 Zwingli published his principal theological work, the "Commentary on True and False Religion." Although in most points he held the ordinary Protestant views, he differed from them in the doctrine of the Sacrament, as will hereafter be explained. He held to predestination as a philosophical tenet, but taught that Christ has redeemed the entire race. He considered original sin a disorder rather than a state involving guilt. He believed that the sages of antiquity were illumined by the Divine Spirit, and in his catalogue of saints he placed Socrates, Seneca, the Catos, and even Hercules. The Reformation was not confined to Zurich. In 1528 it triumphed at Berne, the following year at Basel, and about the same time at St. Gall and Schaffhausen. Everywhere it was attended by the downfall of the oligarchy, which was in favor of foreign alliances and pensions, and the rise of a republican party, which supported the moral and political reforms. The adherents of Zwingli insisted on making the gospel not only a source of light and life to the individual, but also a wholesome leaven in the body politic.

A comparison of Zwingli and of what he did for the Swiss, with Luther and his work among the Germans, reveals marked differences between the two men, and between the movements in which they were the pioneers. It was only after religious struggles of long duration that Luther threw off his allegiance to the Church of Rome, and assailed its teachings and its authority. It cost Zwingli, on the contrary, no conflict of this sort to reject whatever of the prevailing doctrinal or ecclesiastical system of the Latin Church appeared to him at variance with the

Zurich becomes Protestant.

Spread of Protestantism.

Zwingli and Luther.

Scriptures or with common sense. Luther was not a political reformer, however much he sympathized with his people and resented the wrongs which they suffered. His life was devoted to the setting forth of what he believed to be the vital truth of the gospel. In the mind of Zwingli, on the other hand, the rescue of the Swiss from immorality and misgovernment was inseparable from his determination to have the gospel taught in its purity. And yet, however independent in its beginning and peculiar in its aims was the Swiss Reformation, it owed much to the work of the lion-like Saxon reformer and his fellow-laborers. So ready were the papal authorities to wink at all innovations in order that they might recruit their armies from the peasantry, that men did not discern the drift of Zwingli's teaching until the noise of the battle which Luther was waging reached the valleys of Switzerland.

But scarcely had these two branches of the Protestant party begun their career when they came into collision on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The conflict which ensued, occurring as it did just when the enemies of the Lutheran movement in Germany were uniting to withstand its further progress, was an event most unfortunate for the cause of the Reformation. The question upon which the reformers divided, it need not be said, was not to them of minor importance. The mass had been from of old the central act of worship. It had acquired the most exalted place in the dogmatic and ritual system of the Church, through the influence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, of the miraculous transformation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. When, therefore, the reformers of both parties rejected this dogma, together with the associated doctrine of the propitiatory character of the service, the momentous task of formulating a more correct opinion was forced upon them. Luther affirmed the objective presence of the glorified body and blood of Christ in connection with the bread and wine, so that the body and blood, in some mysterious way, are actually received by the communicant whether he be a believer or not. This doctrine has frequently been termed "consubstantiation," although the designation is not generally approved by Lutheran divines. Zwingli, on the other hand, denied that Christ is really present in any such sense, and made the Lord's Supper to be simply a memorial of his atoning death. As soon as Luther heard of the Zwinglian doctrine, he conceived a violent hostility towards it, and could find no language too severe to apply to the tenet and persons of the "Sacramentarians." The reason for this repugnance is not far to

The sacramental conflict.

seek. He felt most deeply the importance of the objective means of grace. In the Word and the Sacraments Christ is still offered as a living reality. Luther's religious feelings were intertwined with the literal interpretation of the words "This is my body." He dreaded everything that tended to resolve religion and religious experience into a process of one's own mind. The doctrine of Zwingli, which Luther had first heard from Carlstadt, was associated in his thoughts with such a divorce of the religious life from the outward, heaven-given means of grace. The efforts of disinterested men like Martin Bucer, the Strassburg theologian, and Philip, the Landgrave of Hesse, to heal a schism which threatened to inflict great disasters on the Protestant cause, proved unavailing. The leaders of both parties met at Marburg in 1529. When they were not able, either at the private conference or at the public assembly, to come to an agreement, Zwingli, with tears in his eyes, offered the hand of fraternal friendship to Luther. But this the Saxon reformer refused to take, since he could not join in Christian fellowship with one who denied what he deemed a fundamental article of the Christian faith. Before they separated, however, they subscribed to a statement of those great points of doctrine upon which they were agreed, and promised to treat one another with all the toleration consistent with a good conscience.

The Marburg
conference.

The catastrophe of the Swiss Reformation was at hand. The five Forest cantons which still adhered to the Roman Church grew more and more hostile to the cities in which Protestantism was established. They entered into a league with Ferdinand of Austria to resist its progress. Already they had begun to persecute the preachers of the reformed doctrine who had fallen into their power, when the citizens of Zurich marched against them and forced them to tear up their compact with Austria. But the hostile relation still continued. Zwingli urged the cities to unite and to overthrow the preponderance which the five Forest cantons enjoyed in the affairs of the confederation over the city cantons, which though less in number were far more populous. But the success of his efforts was defeated by the jealousy of the cities, each of which aspired to be the metropolis of the proposed confederation. The Catholic party joined all their forces and marched suddenly against Zurich. The brave soldiers who hastily gathered to defend the city were overpowered, and at Cappel, Zwingli, who had gone forth as their chaplain, was slain. The Forest cantons had won a signal victory, but were not yet strong enough to con-

Defeat of the
Protestants.

quer the cities. The terms of peace which they wrung from them were, however, humiliating to the Protestants, and checked the progress of the Reformation.

The Reformation in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden was dependent to a large extent upon the political fortunes of these kingdoms, which had been united under one monarch by the Union of Calmar in 1397. Protestantism was favored by Christian II., who was on the throne when the Lutheran movement began. In Denmark, he sought to overthrow the lay and clerical nobility by bettering the condition of the people. He put forth a book of laws in which important ecclesiastical reforms were included. In Sweden, on the contrary, where he aimed to destroy the power of a party of nobles led by the Stures, he espoused the cause of the clergy. But his treachery, and the execution of the Swedish leaders—known as the massacre of Stockholm—excited an undying hatred against Denmark. Christian was now so feared and distrusted in Denmark itself that not even the people whose interests he had furthered would interpose to prevent his downfall. In 1523, Frederic I., Duke of Schleswig and Holstein, was made king. He swore to grant no toleration to the Lutherans. But the reformed doctrine, which first established itself in the duchies, where a milder policy prevailed, gradually made its way into the country, and in 1526 won public recognition from the king himself. The nobles, who were anxious to get possession of the riches of the Church, favored the new royal policy. The Diet of Odense in the following year ordained that Lutheranism should be tolerated, and that the prelates should look to the king, and not to the pope, for ratification of their election. Although Frederic did not deprive the bishops of their power, the Protestant doctrine soon gained the ascendancy. Upon his death, in 1533, the clergy made an effort to restore the old order of things, and refused to sanction the election of Christian III., his son. At the same time, Christian II., who had been deposed in 1523, supported by the Lübeckers, attempted to regain the throne. Lübeck was the most influential of the cities of the Hanseatic League, many of which had given Lutheranism a hospitable reception. There the introduction of the reformed doctrine had been attended by the rise of the democracy. The Lübeckers found that Denmark was no longer disposed to favor their commercial supremacy, and therefore sought to raise to the throne a monarch who would be attached to their interests. But Christian III. soon overcame all his enemies. With his triumph the democratic movement, which had threatened to ally itself

The Reforma-
tion in Den-
mark and
Sweden.

with the Reformation, was subdued. In Denmark, Christian reorganized the ecclesiastical constitution and established bishops and superintendents according to the Lutheran system. As a consequence of this religious revolution Protestantism was received in Norway, which now became a province of Denmark. It also soon gained a foothold on the shores of Iceland.

Meanwhile in Sweden a great political change, which involved a religious revolution, had taken place. Gustavus Vasa, a young noble, whose father had perished in the massacre of Stockholm, resolved to free his country from the hateful yoke of the Danes. The peasants rallied to his support. Town after town fell into his hands. When the news of the deposition of Christian II. reached Sweden, Gustavus was crowned king. He favored Lutheranism, not so much from deep religious convictions as from a steady purpose to break down the ecclesiastical aristocracy, which was well-nigh independent. He raised Lutherans to high offices in Church and State. In all these measures he was obliged to act with caution, for the peasants who had helped him gain the throne were firmly attached to the old Church. In 1527 a crisis came. If the monarchy was to be established on a firm basis, it must be provided with sufficient revenue. There was no way to obtain it but to confiscate the vast wealth of the Church. He therefore resolved to introduce the Reformation by the civil authority. He proposed to the diet assembled at Westeras that it should put at his disposal ecclesiastical property, and should give him the power to regulate the affairs of the Church. Liberty was also to be granted "for preachers to proclaim the pure word of God." He sought to conciliate the nobles by allowing a large portion of the confiscated possessions to pass into their hands. When his proposals met with violent opposition he forthwith renounced the throne. Upon the news of this step, terrified at the anarchy which threatened the country, the diet recalled Gustavus and issued an edict embodying his demands. Protestantism, which had thus been adopted to suit the political purposes of the king, soon won its way to the hearts of the people. The efforts of John III. (1568-1592), with the aid of the Jesuits, to bring back a moderate Catholicism proved a failure. By the Council of Upsala, in 1593, the Augsburg Confession was accepted as the creed of the national Church.

Long before the beginning of the Lutheran Reformation, as we have already seen, Bohemia had been engaged in a struggle to build up a national Church. The doctrines of the Saxon reformers

were favorably received, especially by the Brethren in Unity, a party which had arisen about the middle of the fifteenth century. A large portion of the Calixtines, however, still maintained their conservative position. Nevertheless, when the Smalcaldic War broke out, the majority of the Utraquists of both parties espoused the cause of the elector and shared the disasters which followed his defeat. Many of them fled into Poland and Prussia. The lot of those who remained grew worse and worse, until, early in the next century, they were obliged to submit or to leave the country.

Those whom the early Hussite persecutions had driven forth from Bohemia did much to prepare the way for the spread of the Reformation in Poland and Prussia. It made its way first into East and West Prussia, the one a fief, the other a province, of the now rapidly growing Kingdom of Poland. From here it passed over into Livonia, which, in the treaty of 1561, was annexed to the Polish kingdom. The advance of the Reformation in these neighboring communities made it impossible to exclude it from Poland itself, where many burghers and powerful nobles regarded it with favor. There was an increasing disposition on the part of the representatives of the nation, who assembled in succeeding diets, to grant toleration to those who embraced the evangelical faith. The cause of reform was hindered not so much by the number of its enemies as by the discord of its friends. The Protestant party was divided into the Calvinists, the Lutherans, and the Unitarians, the followers of Faustus Socinus. To heal these divisions was the object to which John à Lasco, a man of noble family, who at Basel had been intimate with Erasmus, and in England with Cranmer, devoted the later years of his life. He had found it impossible to introduce a Reformation after the Erasmian type, and had taken a more decided position on the Protestant side. In 1556 he returned from his sojourn in foreign lands, and labored until his death, in 1560, to promote unity between the Calvinists and Lutherans. The Reformation had in the meantime become firmly established. But, although equal rights were by royal authority guaranteed to all churches in the kingdom, the fate of Protestantism depended mainly on the disposition of the nobles. These the Jesuits sought to win over. To their influence, as well as to the dissensions of the Protestants, the Catholic reaction was indebted for its great success in Poland.

The Protestant movement extended into Hungary through the influence of the Bohemian Brethren and the Waldenses, some of

The Reforma-
tion in Bohe-
mia.

The Reforma-
tion in Po-
land and
Prussia.

whom settled there, and of Hungarian students who brought back from Wittenberg the teachings of Luther and Melancthon. The civil wars which broke out upon the death of Louis II., in 1526, necessitated the practice of toleration by Ferdinand of Austria and John of Zápolya, the rival aspirants for the throne. The evangelical doctrines spread among the people silently and with great rapidity. But here, as in Poland, the Protestants were divided into contending sects, especially upon the question of the Sacrament. The parties of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin had each of them a set of adherents. Notwithstanding these troubles, however, Protestantism continued to gain ground until the latter part of the century, when, under the auspices of the Jesuits, a strong Catholic reaction set in.

During the ten years which followed the Peace of Nuremberg, Charles V. was compelled by his wars with the Turks and with Francis I. to leave the Protestants undisturbed. Neither the opposition of its enemies nor the mistaken zeal of its pretended friends could check the rapid progress of the Reformation. The wild excesses of the Anabaptist communists at Münster, with whom the Lutherans had no sympathy, were quickly brought to an end by the neighboring Catholic princes. The armed restoration of the exiled Duke of Würtemberg established Protestantism in the heart of Southern Germany. The league of Smalcald was now extended by the accession of princes and cities.

Alarmed at the growing strength of the Lutheran party, the Catholics united, ostensibly for mutual defence, in the Holy League of Nuremberg. The emperor, who needed the military support of the Protestants in order to bring his wars to a successful issue, was anxious to heal the ecclesiastical schism which divided Germany. The most notable attempt that was made to do this was at the Diet and Conference of Ratisbon in 1541. The moderate men of both parties met here to formulate articles of concord. The Lutherans were represented by Melancthon, the emperor by Groppe and Pflug, the pope by Cardinal Contarini, one of the leaders of the counter-reformation in the Catholic Church. In the conference an actual agreement was reached on what were esteemed the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith—the nature of man, original sin, redemption, and justification. The differences on the sacrament and on the authority of the pope remained to be adjusted. But all further efforts at concord were stopped by the intrigues of the French king, and by the fears of the pope on the one hand,

The Reformation in Hungary.

Progress of Protestantism in Germany.

The Catholic League, 1528.

Diet and Conference of Ratisbon.

and of Luther and the Elector of Saxony on the other. The policy of reconciliation had failed, but the emperor could not resort to force as long as he was entangled in foreign wars. He was therefore obliged to sanction the peace of Nuremberg and await a favorable opportunity to crush the Protestant party. Meanwhile the Reformation had advanced on every side. It was established in Brandenburg, ducal Saxony, and in Brunswick, after the expulsion of the duke by the Elector of Saxony and the Landgrave of Hesse. It gained adherents in Austria and Bavaria. Even the ecclesiastical Elector of Cologne took measures for its adoption in his dominions.

But the Protestant party was torn by internal dissensions. The cities complained of the arbitrary proceedings of the princes. Duke

Division
among Prot-
estants.

Maurice, of Saxony, was more than once on the verge of war with the elector, and finally, in 1542, abandoned the

League of Smalcald. Thus, with weakened forces, the Protestants were obliged to contend against the emperor, who, having made peace, in 1544, with Francis I., found his hands free to deal with the affairs of Germany. Nevertheless, they refused to take part in the Council of Trent, which the pope had at length been persuaded to summon. Charles still continued, by new proposals of union, to blind them to his real intentions. Meanwhile he won over Maurice of Saxony, whose desire for the title and territories of the elector was much stronger than his religious convictions. The emperor professed to attack the two leaders of the Smalcaldic League—the Elector and the Landgrave of Hesse—not as Protestants, but as disturbers of the peace of the empire.

While the time for the momentous struggle was rapidly drawing near, Luther died (February 18, 1546). His last days were

Last days of
Luther.

full of weariness and suffering. He took dark views of the frivolity and wickedness of the times, but his sublime faith in God and his assurance of the final victory of the truth never left him. His dogmatism became more boisterous in the battles which he waged, and in the days of ill-health and advancing age. During the latter years of his life his relations with Melancthon were partially clouded by theological differences. Melancthon modified his doctrine of predestination, and gradually came to believe that the will has a co-ordinate agency in conversion. On the subject of the Sacrament, likewise, he was inclined to hold the view midway between Luther and Zwingli, which Calvin advocated—that Christ is really received in the Lord's Supper, but spiritually, and by the believer alone. Although Melancthon lived in

daily fear that these changes of opinion would provoke an outburst of the reformer's passionate nature, he never lost his respect and regard for Luther as a devout and heroic man, endowed with noble qualities of heart and mind. Nor did Luther ever cease to love his younger associate. No one will question that Luther, notwithstanding his faults and defects, has been a great power in the history of the world. No one doubts that he was a born leader of men. The originality of thought and virility of expression; the insight into the deep things of the spirit; the vein of humor that mingles itself, unbidden, with the most profound and serious reflection; the play of imagination—these qualities, which characterize the utterances of Luther, constitute an unfailing charm. One who was himself a poet, Coleridge, has said of him: "He was a poet, indeed, as great a poet as ever lived in any age or country; but poetic images were so vivid that they mastered the poet's own mind;" "Luther did not write, he acted poems." Of his profound influence over the German people, no one has spoken more impressively than the most accomplished of the modern German school of Catholic theologians, the chief of the Old Catholics, Dr. Döllinger. This life-long opponent of Protestantism dwells on Luther's complete comprehension of the German nature: "Heart and mind of the Germans were in his hand like the lyre in the hand of the musician." He speaks of Luther's irresistible eloquence, which carried everything before it. "Even those Germans," he adds, "who abhorred him as the principal heretic and seducer of the nation, cannot escape; they must discourse with his words, they must think with his thoughts."

The Smalcaldic War, which broke out in 1546, resulted, through the bad generalship of the elector, in disaster. The elector himself was captured in 1547, at the battle of Mühlberg, and the landgrave was soon after obliged to submit. But the triumph of the emperor was impaired by his quarrel with Pope Paul III. It was the plan of Charles to subject the Protestants to the Catholic hierarchy, and to allay their discontent by the introduction of certain external reforms. In his attempt to carry out this purpose he promulgated a provisional scheme, called the Augsburg Interim. But he could look neither to the pope nor to the Council of Trent for the co-operation which was necessary to complete the work. In spite of his repeated remonstrances, the council had first proceeded not to measures of reform, but to pronounce a condemnation upon the Protestant doctrines. Paul, in order still further to embarrass the emperor,

The Smalcaldic War.

The Augsburg Interim.

whose absolute triumph might endanger the temporal power of the papacy in Italy, transferred the council to Bologna, and withdrew the papal troops from the army of Charles just before the crisis of the conflict in Germany. He then began to negotiate with the French king. Not only the pope, but also zealous Catholics everywhere, regarded the emperor's ecclesiastical measures in Germany as an encroachment on the rights of the Church. Meanwhile the Germans themselves were angered to see their country treated as conquered territory. Those who refused to adopt the Augsburg Interim were reduced to submission by Spanish troops. In Northern Germany alone was it generally withstood. The city of Magdeburg, which was the centre of this resistance, was besieged by Maurice of Saxony, to whom the execution of the imperial ban had been committed. In his own territories the duke introduced the Leipsic Interim, a modified form of the one drawn up at Augsburg. The accession of Julius III., who was favorable to Charles, and his reassembling of the Council at Trent, seemed to promise the emperor that success which had so long eluded him. But clouds were gathering in the sky. The Turks had kindled anew the flames of war in Hungary, and the French king, Henry II., was uniting with the enemies of Charles in Italy. The German princes were jealous of the favor shown to Spanish advisers, and were enraged at the continued presence of foreign troops. Maurice was discontented with the result of his duplicity. He had the title and the territories which he coveted, but he had also won the hatred of those whose cause he had betrayed, and who looked on him as another Judas. He was chagrined to find that he did not possess influence enough with the emperor to procure the release of his father-in-law, the Landgrave of Hesse. The insults which he had to endure from the Spaniards still further embittered his feelings. He now resolved to rescue Germany from the oppressor, into whose hands he had himself delivered her. Using the siege of Magdeburg as a cover for his operations, he laid his plans with profound secrecy. He suddenly marched southward, crossed the Alps, and forced Charles to fly in haste from Innspruck. The captive princes were released and the Protestants were granted equal rights until the differences should be settled by a national assembly or a general council. At the Diet of Augsburg, in 1555, the religious peace was concluded. It embodied the celebrated maxim, *Cujus regio ejus religio*—the religion of the people is to be that of their prince. To this was added the Ecclesiastical Reservation, which provided that if a prince

Maurice at-
tacks Charles.

The Peace of
Augsburg.

of the Church became a Protestant he should resign his see. In return for this concession to the Catholics it was ordained that Protestants were to enjoy toleration in the dominions of ecclesiastical princes. In the terms of this peace were the seeds of that strife which was to distract Germany for generations to come. For a time it did not check the progress of the Reformation. The complete failure of his efforts to restore the unity of the German Church, or to crush the Protestant party, was a great blow to Charles. He refused personally to take any part in the proceedings which led to the peace. After he had laid aside the cares of the empire, and had retired to the Convent of Yuste, he expressed regret that he allowed the man who stirred up all the commotion to depart in peace from the Diet of Worms.

CHAPTER III.

JOHN CALVIN AND THE GENEVAN REFORMATION.

LUTHER had firmly established the Reformation in Germany, and Zwingli had fallen on the field of Cappel, before John Calvin began to write the "Institutes," and to set in order the affairs of Geneva. Calvin belonged to the second generation of reformers, whose work it was to unfold more clearly and more systematically the principles of Protestantism. He was a Frenchman, and was born in the year 1509, at Noyon, in Picardy. In his youth he had no experience of the rough conflict with penury which many of the German and Swiss reformers were obliged to undergo. His father's position as fiscal agent of the lordship of Noyon and secretary of the diocese, as well as the esteem in which he was held by the nobility, was a source of temporal advantage to the son. He was educated with the children of the noble family of Mommor, and when but twelve years of age was appointed to a chaplaincy with revenues sufficient for his support. To this benefice another was added a few years later. At the outset he was destined for the priesthood. At Paris, whither he was sent to pursue his studies, he became distinguished for his uncommon intellectual powers and for a certain strict and severe tone of character. He had not been there long, however, when his father, from ambitious motives, changed his plans and determined to qualify him for the profession of a jurist. He accordingly went to Orleans and Bourges,

Early life of
Calvin.

and attended the lectures of celebrated doctors of the law. He undermined his naturally weak constitution by working far into the night, arranging and digesting what he had heard during the day. Early in the morning he would awake to go over in his mind what he had thus reduced to order. He attained such proficiency in legal studies that frequently, when the professors were absent, he was invited to take their place. At the same time, influenced by a relative, Peter Olivétan, who became the first Protestant translator of the Bible into French, he began to direct his attention to the Scriptures. His mind was still more prepared to receive the teachings of Protestantism by the study of the New Testament in the original, undertaken at the earnest solicitation of his Greek professor, Melchior Wolmar. But in his first publication, an annotated edition of Seneca's treatise on "Clemency," he appeared not as a reformer but as a cultivated humanist, displaying much anxiety that his book should find a ready sale. Not long after the issue of this

His conversion.

book, his "sudden conversion," to use his own words, took place. His sense of the holiness of God and of the ideal excellence of the divine law was so strong that his sins and errors seemed like a deep abyss in which he was weltering. Neither the penances nor the consolations of the Church were of any avail. He must throw himself upon the mercy of God, he must enter by faith into the fellowship of Christ. Calvin's whole soul was now absorbed in the study of the Bible. He did not, however, neglect his other pursuits, nor did he purpose to enter upon the active career of a reformer. He preferred to pursue his studies in seclusion. But he had no sooner returned to Paris than he became a recognized leader of the Protestants, sought out by all who desired religious counsel and instruction. Persecution soon broke

His exile from Paris.

up the little company. Calvin's friend, Nicholas Cop, the newly elected rector of the university, in his opening address clearly set forth the central doctrine of the reformers. His orthodox hearers were astounded. The doctors of theology and the Franciscans set to work to bring Cop, as well as Calvin—who, it soon appeared, was the real author of the address—to punishment; but both escaped from the city. Calvin now visited Béarn, where, at the court of Margaret of Navarre, the sister of Francis I., he met the aged Lefèvre, who, although he never renounced the old Church, is entitled to be called the father of French Protestantism. Having given up his benefices, which his conscience would no longer allow him to retain, he returned to Paris, only to be driven out again by the fierce persecution which the imprudent zeal of the reform-

ers in posting placards against the mass drew down upon them. He passed through Strassburg, where he was cordially received by Bucer, and dwelt for a time in Basel. Here he found the retirement which he so much prized. But he was not forgetful of the sorrows of his brethren in France. The king had begun the persecutions which darkened the later years of his reign. In order to allay the anger of the German Lutherans at the cruel treatment of their fellow-reformers, he accused the French Protestants of all the lawless fanaticism of the Anabaptist sectaries. To prove to Francis the falsity of these charges, and, if possible, to bring him into sympathy with the new doctrine, formed a part of Calvin's object in writing the "Institutes of the Christian Religion." In his dedication to Francis he vindicated the cause of the king's oppressed subjects, concluding with these words: "But if your ears are so preoccupied with the whispers of the malevolent as to leave no opportunity for the accused to speak for themselves, and if those outrageous furies, with your connivance, continue to persecute with imprisonment, scourges, tortures, confiscations, and flames, we shall indeed, like sheep destined to the slaughter, be reduced to the greatest extremities. Yet shall we in patience possess our souls, and wait for the mighty hand of the Lord, which undoubtedly will in time appear, and show itself armed for the deliverance of the poor from their affliction, and for the punishment of their despisers, who now exult in such perfect security. May the Lord, the King of kings, establish your throne with righteousness and your kingdom with equity!" This remarkable work was the production of a young man twenty-seven years of age.

The "Institutes" were not only a contribution to theology, but also to literature. By the dignified and forcible style in which they were written, they exercised a profound influence in shaping modern French prose. The Latin edition is also distinguished for the classical purity of its language. Calvin was an exact and finished scholar. His words did not touch the hearts of the common people as did those of Luther. He was more of a patrician in his culture and temper, and addressed the higher and more educated class. It was mainly through others that his influence reached the lower ranks of society. The work which his "Institutes" did for the Reformation was to reduce its doctrinal ideas to a systematic form. Hitherto a brief and incomplete treatise by Melancthon was the only manual to which those who sympathized with the new doctrine could resort for instruction. Calvin was well qualified for the peculiar task which was set before him. He

(Characteris-
tics of Calvin.

had a well-trained, logical mind, disciplined by legal studies, and he had that genius for organization for which the French nation is distinguished. He was unlike the other great reformers in the fact that his opinions underwent no change from the time of his conversion until his death. The "Institutes," though much enlarged in subsequent editions, preserved fully the identity of their earliest teachings. Their pre-eminent value was immediately recognized, not only by the friends of Protestantism, but also by its enemies, who called the book "The Koran of the Heretics." In Calvin's

system the Bible is the sole standard of doctrine. The

His system.

Spirit of God gives an insight into what is there set forth, and a conviction of the truth of the gospel. Calvin never lost his reverence for the Church; not the Church over which the Roman hierarchy ruled, but the Church which is established after the model of the New Testament, and is known by the right administration of the Sacraments and the teaching of the Word. He who withdraws from this community cuts himself off from Christ. Within this body is the Church invisible, composed of the elect, or all true believers. What has been deemed the main characteristic of Calvin's system, the doctrine of predestination, is a point upon which his views were at first shared by the other reformers. They all maintained the Augustinian theology, in opposition to Pelagianism, which in their minds was connected with the errors of the mediæval system, and especially with the doctrine of merit. But Calvin continued to emphasize this idea after others had allowed it to retreat into the background. In this peculiarity he was influenced not only by his deep sense of the exaltation of God, but by his concern for the practical interests of religion. He believed all men to be in such complete bondage to sin that God alone can save them. According to Augustine, in the fall of Adam the race was involved in a common catastrophe. The will of man is free to sin, but utterly unable to become holy. All men are justly under condemnation and objects of God's wrath. A part of them he elects to eternal life; the others he leaves to suffer the righteous penalty of the broken law. In the "Institutes" Calvin went further. He appears to declare that even the sin of Adam was the object of an efficient decree, the effect of divine agency. In his later writings, however, he moderates his expressions on this point, and confines himself to the assertion of a permissive decree. In election Calvin saw a work of God's grace which gave security against the assaults of temptation. Unlike Augustine and Luther, he held that the true believer can never fall away. Notwithstanding-

ing the fact that he emphasized man's inability to do right, he affirmed in the strongest terms his moral and responsible nature. The mysteries of predestination and election he did not pretend to fathom. He believed that for every decree of the Almighty there were reasons both wise and good, though hidden from the mind of man.

Calvin was not only a theologian but a commentator. If Melancthon laid the foundation of Protestant exegesis, Calvin did much to build up the edifice. His preference for this sort of scholarly labor was justified by the clearness, thoroughness, and conciseness of the results. He was candid and manly in the discussion of a passage. He never evaded difficulties, but grappled with them. Luther was the translator, but Calvin the interpreter, of the Word. As a practical reformer, Calvin was no rash iconoclast. While he would sweep away the corruptions which had grown up through the influence of mediæval superstition, he would have everything done in order, and would not yield to whims or to the outcries of fanatics.

In all the activities of his life certain marked traits of character were manifest. The intensity of his convictions induced a lack of patience with dissent. Even his letters to his friends were not free from a censorious tone which threatened to alienate from him men of so mild a nature as Melancthon. His natural irritability was increased by his physical sufferings, and by the multitude of cares which continually crowded upon him. Sometimes "the wild beast of his anger," to use his own expression respecting himself, raged without control. There was in Calvin's piety a large infusion of the Old Testament spirit. It was an absorbing aim with him to exalt the law of God, and to bring his own life and the lives of others, to bring Church and State, into subjection to it. Whatever seemed to cast dishonor upon the Almighty, as, for example, attacks made upon the truth, he felt bound to meet with a pitiless hostility. Such a man was liable to mistake his own resentful feelings towards an opponent for zeal in the cause of God. Calvin did not touch human life at so many points as did Luther. He did not possess that sympathy with nature which was a perpetual solace to the Saxon reformer. Although he lived for years in the midst of the most beautiful scenery in the world, his writings contain little, if anything, suggested by it. He was engrossed in the affairs of a great spiritual conflict. Forgetful of his bodily suffering, of his physical timidity, of his love for seclusion and for the quiet pursuits of a scholar, he plunged

Calvin's Com-
mentaries.

Personal
traits of
Calvin.

into the turmoil of the Genevan Reformation, and into the still more momentous struggle of Protestantism in France and in the other countries of the West. It is no wonder that, after his death, the senate of Geneva, which knew how disinterested, resolute, fearless he had been, spoke of "the majesty" of his character.

Not long after the publication of the "Institutes" Calvin visited Italy and remained for a time at the court of the accomplished Duchess of Ferrara, the daughter of Louis XII. of France, and the protector of the Protestants. On his way back to Basel he was obliged to pass through Geneva. It was while he was stopping there for the night, expecting on the following morning to continue his journey to Basel, that the event occurred which changed the course of his life.

After the battle of Cappel, the Forest cantons had been busy driving Protestantism out of those districts which were not immediately dependent upon the cities. It had, however, maintained itself in Zurich, Basel, and Berne, and had recently become established in Geneva. After a long struggle with their bishop and with his ally, the Duke of Savoy, the Genevese had, with the aid of Berne and Freiburg, achieved a political independence. In

1532, William Farel, a bold and powerful preacher, as well as an earnest reformer, came to the city. Like

Calvin, he had been driven out of France, his native country, by persecution. His immoderate zeal often put his life in imminent peril. On one occasion he snatched the relics from the hand of a priest in a procession and flung them into an adjacent river. He was at first driven away from Geneva, and owed his life to the bursting of a gun which was fired at him. But the influence of Berne began to be felt in that city. Farel returned, and this time triumphed over his enemies. Protestantism was established by vote of the citizens. All the Church festivals except Sunday were abolished, and various amusements, such as dancing and masquerades, were forbidden. The people took a solemn oath to live according to the rule of the gospel. But a pleasure-loving and even licentious town could not easily be brought under such strict discipline. Signs of discontent speedily manifested themselves. A strong party arose which clamored for the ancient customs and the former liberty. Geneva was torn by intestine strife, when, on August 5, 1536, Calvin arrived there. Farel, having heard of his presence, visited him, and besought him to remain and assist him in his work. But Calvin pleaded his devotion to the more retired pursuits of a scholar. The ardent reformer, finding persuasion of

The Reforma-
tion in Gen-
eva.

Farel,
1489-1565.

no avail, told him that he might put forward his studies as a pretext, but that the curse of God would light on him if he refused to engage in his work. Calvin was terror-stricken at these words, spoken with the fervor of a prophet. He felt as if the hand of the

Almighty had been stretched out of heaven and laid upon him. Such a summons he dared not disobey.

His labors began immediately. A catechism was composed for the instruction of the young. The bands of discipline were drawn still more tightly about a community already rebellious. The people were forbidden to wear vain ornaments, or to engage in obnoxious sports. The Libertines, as the party which opposed these innovations was called, soon gained the upper hand. Calvin and his associates found themselves in conflict with the majority of the citizens, and even with the government itself. Having preached on Easter Sunday (1538) in spite of the prohibition

of the magistrates, and having also refused to administer the Sacrament, they were banished from the city.

Calvin went to Strassburg. His joy at being delivered from the troubles which beset his work at Geneva and in finding himself at liberty to pursue his studies was greater, he says, than under the circumstances was becoming. But in Strassburg, Bucer urged him to take charge of a church of French refugees. Here, again, it was not entreaties, but a prophetic warning, drawn from the life of the prophet Jonah, which conquered his reluctance. During the three years which he spent away from Geneva he became acquainted with some of the Saxon theologians. He did not meet Luther, whom he held in high honor, but with Melanchthon he formed a friendship which lasted until they were separated by death. Melanchthon gradually came over to his view of the Sacrament, but never to his doctrine of predestination. When Bolsec was arrested for preaching against this doctrine, Melanchthon wrote to a friend that they had thrown a man into prison in Geneva for not agreeing with Zeno. Calvin, notwithstanding the peculiarities of his temperament, formed strong attachments. He cherished a tender regard for his wife, to whom he was married at Strassburg, and was intimate with Farel and with Viret, another of the Genevan ministers. Beza loved him as a father. Calvin's relations with the followers of Zwingli were for a time unsettled. They at first suspected him of trying to bring in the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper. His view of predestination was also distasteful to them, for Zwingli's opinions on this subject were simply speculative. It was with difficulty that Calvin succeeded in

allaying their fears, and in bringing about a union by the acceptance of common formularies.

Quiet was not restored to Geneva by the banishment of the preachers. Scenes of violence and licentiousness became frequent.

Return of Calvin. The Catholics were at work endeavoring to restore the old religion. Cardinal Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras, addressed to the senate a flattering letter to urge them to return to the fold of the Roman Church. To this document Calvin replied in so masterly a way that the city looked again for help to its banished preacher. Deputies were sent to persuade him to return. They followed him from Strassburg to Worms. To their entreaties

1541. he answered more in tears than in words. At length he yielded, and once more took up his abode in Geneva, there to live for the remainder of his days.

Under his influence a new ecclesiastical and civil order was created. It was the duty of the State to foster the interests of the

Church and State. Church, to carry out its requirements, and to inflict temporal penalties on those who disobeyed its rules.

Ecclesiastical discipline was in the hands of the consistory, which was composed of six clergymen and twelve laymen. It exercised a moral censorship over every person in the city. The high and the low, the rich and the poor, were alike subject to its inflexible laws. It possessed the power of excommunication; and excommunication, if it continued beyond a certain time, was followed by civil penalties. The preachers of the Genevan Church were chosen with great care by the ministers already in office, the congregation, however, having a veto power. They formed the "Venerable Company," and, in order that a high standard of professional service might be maintained, met together once a month for mutual censure.

Calvin's work in Geneva was not confined to the arrangement of the ecclesiastical system. The respect which the citizens enter-

Conflict of parties. tained for him gave him a controlling influence in the framing of the civil laws. Although he was well qualified

for this task by his legal training at Orleans and Bourges, his measures were conceived too much in the spirit of the Hebrew theocracy. Not only profaneness and drunkenness, but innocent amusements and the teaching of divergent theological doctrines, were severely punished. Nor was this all. Trifling offences were visited with severe penalties. It was impossible that a city of twenty thousand inhabitants should rest content under such stringent discipline and such stern enactments. The elements of disaffection disclosed themselves soon after Calvin's return. His chief opponents, as

before, were the Libertines. They were composed of two parties, the Spirituals, a pantheistic sect, which among other things advocated a lax marriage relation akin to modern "Free Love," and the Patriots. These were jealous of the Frenchmen, who flocked to the city, and they were anxious to restore to the people the power which, under Calvin's influence, was gradually passing into the hands of a select number of magistrates. But the prosperity which the new order of things brought to the industrious, law-abiding citizens, raised up for Calvin many supporters. The numbers of this party were swelled by the foreign immigrants, many of whom were admitted to citizenship. The conflict was long and bitter. The members of the Libertine faction endeavored to intimidate Calvin. They fired guns under his windows at night; they set dogs on him in the street. No device was left untried to break down his determination, but all in vain.

In a commonwealth based on such principles as was that of Geneva, it was inevitable that outspoken religious dissent should be suppressed by force. The modern idea of the limited function of the state had not yet arisen. In the system which had ruled the world for centuries, heresy was considered a crime which the civil authority was bound to punish. The Old Testament theocratic view was held to be still applicable to civil society. Although there were occasional pleas put forth by the reformers for toleration, their general position is clearly defined in the words of Calvin: "Seeing that the defenders of the papacy are so bitter in behalf of their superstitions, that in their atrocious fury they shed the blood of the innocent, it should shame Christian magistrates that in the protection of certain truth they are entirely destitute of spirit." Such convictions were not long in bearing their appropriate fruit. A noted case was that of Michael Servetus. He was a Spaniard of an ingenious, inquisitive, restless mind. He early turned his attention to theological questions. His book on the "Errors of the Trinity" appeared in 1531. In it he advocated a view closely allied to the Sabellian theory, and an idea of the incarnation in which the common belief of two natures in Christ had no place. After a vain attempt to draw Calvin into a controversy he went to Paris and applied himself to studies in natural science and medicine, for which he had a remarkable aptitude. For many years he resided at Vienne, in the South of France, engaged in the practice of his profession. During this time he conformed outwardly to the Catholic Church, and was not suspected of heresy. It was his second book, the "Res-

Suppression
of dissent.

Servetus,
1509-1553.

toration of Christianity," a copy of which he sent to Calvin, which brought him into trouble. In this work he advocated theories of the world and of God which were pantheistic in their drift. When it was discovered that Servetus was the author, he was arrested and brought to trial. He denied that he wrote either this book or the one on the "Errors of the Trinity." But some pages of an annotated copy of the "Institutes," which he had sent to Calvin, together with a parcel of letters, were obtained from Geneva. Seeing that conviction was inevitable, he succeeded in making his escape. Not long after, he went to Geneva, where he lived unrecognized for a month. But as soon as his presence was known, Calvin procured his arrest. In the trial before the senate, which followed, Servetus defended his opinions boldly and acutely, but with a strange outpouring of violent denunciation. He caricatured the doctrine of the Trinity. He intermingled physical theories and theological speculation in a manner considered by his hearers in the highest degree dangerous and even blasphemous. As he was setting forth his view of the participation of all things in the Deity, he told Calvin, contemptuously, that if he only understood natural science he would be able to comprehend that subject. While his trial was in progress messengers came from the ecclesiastical court at Vienne demanding their prisoner. Servetus preferred to remain in Geneva, relying perhaps on the support of the Libertines. But they were unable to save him. After his condemnation he sent for Calvin and asked his pardon for the indignities which he had cast upon him. He maintained his opinions with heroic constancy, and was burned at the stake on the 27th of October, 1553. No doubt Calvin had expected, and from the course of Servetus in the past had reason to expect, that he would abjure his errors. When this hope failed, he tried to have the mode of carrying the sentence into execution mitigated. Yet he believed that such an attack upon the fundamental truths of religion as Servetus had made should be punished with death. This opinion he shared with Bullinger, Zwingli's successor, and even with the gentlest of the reformers, Melancthon.

Two years after the death of Servetus the Libertine faction made a last determined effort to overthrow the ecclesiastical system which Calvin had built up. When intrigue did not succeed, they resorted to arms. The complete failure of the insurrection was a death-blow to their party. Calvin did not rejoice in the fall of his enemies, although he keenly felt the many calumnies which they had heaped upon him. It was

Defeat of
the Liber-
tines, 1555.

in allusion to the vexations incident to his position that he once said, "To my power which they envy, O that they were the successors!"

Notwithstanding the burdens which the care of the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the city laid upon him, Calvin performed a great work as a teacher and as a counsellor of statesmen and reformers in many lands. On alternate weeks he preached every day, besides giving weekly three theological lectures. His memory was remarkable. Without a scrap of paper in his hand, he would expound the most intricate passages of the prophets. Students flocked to Geneva to hear his instructions. Men like Knox, who sought there a refuge from persecution, went away thoroughly imbued with his ideas. Under Calvin's guidance Geneva became to the Romanic nations what Wittenberg was to the Germans. A theological school was founded there, and Beza was placed over it. Calvin's influence was extended not only by the circulation of his writings, but by his vast correspondence, on the rolls of which were monarchs, princes, and nobles, as well as theologians. It was in the affairs of the Reformation in France that his agency was especially prominent. Those who were struggling there to advance the cause of Protestantism looked to him for direction and support. Geneva was the refuge for the persecuted and the stronghold from which missionaries went forth to continue the battle. From its printing-presses Bibles and numerous other publications in the French tongue were scattered abroad.

When his life was drawing to a close, Calvin had the good fortune to see Geneva delivered from faction, and the institutions of learning, which he had founded, in a prosperous condition. But his labors did not cease. As had been his custom, after the arduous public duties of the day were over he continued to devote himself in the evening to his favorite studies and to the writing of his books. When he became too feeble to sit up, he dictated to an amanuensis from his bed. Although his body was wasted by disease, his mind retained its vigor and clearness to the last. When he felt the end approaching, he sent for the Senate, at whose deliberations he had so often assisted. As they gathered about his bed, he thanked them for the tokens of honor which they had granted to him, and desired their forgiveness for the outbreaks of anger which they had borne with so much forbearance. He assured them of the sincerity and honesty with which he had expounded the word of God among them, and urged upon them humility and watchfulness in guarding the State from the evils which still threat-

Labors of
Calvin.

Last days of
Calvin.

ened it. He then offered a fervent prayer, and took each one of them by the hand, as with tears they parted from him. Two days afterward he called the ministers of the city and of the neighborhood to his bedside, and spoke to them in a similar manner. "We parted from him," says Beza, "with our eyes bathed in tears, and our hearts full of unspeakable grief." He died on the 27th of May, 1564. Calvin was endowed with an understanding of wonderful power. The imagination and the sentiments, however, were not proportionately developed. He had a talent for organization which qualified him to become the founder, not only of an ecclesiastical system, but of an enduring school of thought. In the history of theology he stands on the same plane, as regards the character of his influence, with Thomas Aquinas. He forgot himself in his devotion to what he believed to be the will of the Almighty. His fear of God, that fear which the Hebrew prophets felt, left no room in his soul for the fear of men. The combination of his qualities was such that he excited the most profound admiration in some, and an equally profound aversion in others. No one, however, who carefully reviews the course of his life and the permanence of his influence, can call in question either his moral or intellectual pre-eminence.

The principles which underlay Calvin's theological and ecclesiastical system have been a powerful factor in the growth of civil liberty. Nevertheless, in the constitution which he created at Geneva, the jurisdiction of the Church was extended over the details of conduct to such a degree as to abridge unduly the liberty of the individual. The power of coercion which was given to the civil authority subverted freedom in religious opinion and worship. But, notwithstanding these grave errors, which Calvin shared, in a great degree at least, with the age in which he lived, he vindicated the right of the Church to perform its own functions without the interference of the State. The Church thus became the nursery of liberty. Wherever Calvinism spread—in England, Scotland, Holland, or France—men learned to defend their rights against the tyranny of civil rulers. Moreover, the separation of Church from State was the first step in the development of religious freedom. After that step was taken, the State would gradually cease to lend its power to the Church as the executioner of its laws. In the Calvinistic system, laymen took a responsible part in the selection of the clergy and in the management of the affairs of the Church. The privilege of governing themselves, which they enjoyed in the Christian society, they would soon claim in the com-

Calvinism
and civil
liberty.

monwealth. Nor was the pervading principle of Calvin's theology—the idea of the sovereignty of God—without an influence in the same direction. In comparison with that Almighty Ruler upon whose will the lives and fortunes of men depended, all earthly potentates sank into insignificance. At the same time the dignity of the individual was enhanced by the consciousness that he was chosen of God. Uplifted by such ideas and by the aspirations which they created, the people were able to humble the might of kings.

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE.

FRANCE had already witnessed two movements for reform before the rise of Protestantism. In the fifteenth century the Gallican theologians had sought to remove ecclesiastical abuses and to check the encroachments of the papacy. But they desired to correct, not the doctrines, but the administration, of the Church. When they consigned to the flames John Huss, they marked the limits of the change which they wished to bring about. None were more hostile to all doctrinal innovations than their successors in the College of the Sorbonne, the Theological Faculty at Paris, and in the Parliament. Two centuries before the rise of the Gallican reformers, a movement of a much more radical character began in Southern France. Here the anti-sacerdotal sects—the Waldenses, and the Catharists—flourished for a time. But only a small remnant survived the terrible persecutions to which they were then subjected, and continued to cherish the simple faith of their ancestors. It was not from them, but from the literary and scientific spirit which was awakened through the close intercourse with Italy, during the reigns of Louis XII. and Francis I., that the earliest reformatory movements of the sixteenth century arose. Francis was especially anxious to attract men of genius to his court. Frenchmen visited Italy and brought back the classical culture which was there acquired. Transalpine poets, artists, and scholars, enticed by the munificence of the king, and dreading Spanish tyranny, came to France, and still further promoted the revival of letters. But the introduction of the new studies, especially Hebrew and Greek, was bitterly opposed by the Sorbonne, under the leadership of the Syndic Beda. Thus two

Sources of
Protestantism
in France.

parties were formed, the one devoted to the new learning, the other jealously guarding the mediæval theology.

Jacques Lefèvre, who was revered among the Humanists as the restorer of philosophy and science in the university, was also the

Lefèvre,
1460-1536.

father of the French Reformation. A student of Aristotle, his deep religious spirit impelled him to the earnest

study of the Scriptures. In 1509 he published a commentary on the Psalms, and in 1512 a commentary on the epistles of Paul. In these books he clearly taught the doctrine of justification by faith, and treated the Bible as the supreme and sufficient authority in religion. He believed that a reformation of the Church was near at hand. As early as 1512 he said to Farel, who afterwards became distinguished as a Protestant leader in France and in Switzerland: "God will renovate the world, and you will be a witness of it." But his writings did not at first stir up opposition. They were addressed to the learned, and were, moreover, mystical rather than polemical in their character. As soon, however, as the noise of the movement in Saxony reached Paris, the doctors of the Sorbonne became alarmed. They were resolved not to tolerate any departure from the dogmatic system of Aquinas. Heresy was stigmatized by them, and punished by the Parliament, the highest judicial tribunal, as an offence against the State. In 1521, the same year that they pronounced Luther a heretic and a blasphemer, they condemned a dissertation of Lefèvre on a point of evangelical history on which he had controverted the traditional opinion. He, with Farel, Gérard Roussel, and other preachers, found an asylum with Briçonnet, Bishop of Meaux, who shared their doctrinal views, and who was earnestly engaged in reforming the ecclesiastical administration of his diocese.

Briçonnet,
Bishop of
Meaux, 1516-
1534.

Lefèvre now put forth a translation of the New Testament from the Vulgate, and expounded more distinctly than before the evangelical doctrines. It seemed as if Meaux was to be another Wittenberg. But the Parliament of Paris determined to crush out the heresies which infected that district. Briçonnet bowed before the storm, abjured the new opinions, and even countenanced the persecution of those whom he had himself instructed. Lefèvre fled to Strassburg, but was afterwards recalled by Francis I., and finally took up his abode in the court of the king's sister, Margaret, Queen of Navarre.

There were two parties at the French court. The queen-mother, Louise of Savoy, and with her the Chancellor Duprat, was ready to aid the Sorbonne in the persecution of heterodox

opinions. Louise was persuaded by this wily ecclesiastic that by so doing she could atone for the immoralities of her private life.

Margaret,
Queen of Na-
varre, 1492-
1549. Margaret, on the other hand, a versatile and accomplished princess, shared many of the doctrines of the reformers, and strove to save them from persecution.

The deep vein of mysticism which penetrated all her religious beliefs kept her from breaking away from the Church or from discountenancing the mass. And yet her poem, the "Mirror of the Sinful Soul," was so Protestant in its tone as to draw down upon her the wrath of the Sorbonne. After her marriage with Henry d'Albret, the King of Navarre, she continued, in her own little court and principality, to promote the evangelical doctrine and to protect its adherents.

Francis I. himself was vacillating in his attitude towards the Protestant movement. His enthusiasm for literature and art

Character and
policy of
Francis I.;
b. 1494,
d. 1547. prompted him to favor a reformation after the Erasmian type. He had no love for the Sorbonne, for the Parliament, or for the monks; but the necessities of the political situation often constrained him to suffer the policy of Louise and the chancellor to prevail.

During the regency which was established after his capture at the battle of Pavia, heretics were burned in Paris and in the provinces. It was only the sudden return of Francis from Spain which saved Louis de Berquin, an accomplished scholar and a favorite courtier, from the flames. Even in this case the theologians were successful in their second attack, and Berquin perished. Nor did they stop there. They even ventured to lampoon the king's sister in a scholastic comedy, throwing out charges of heresy against her. This insult to the royal household aroused the anger of Francis. He did not rest content with the mere punishment of the offenders, but authorized Gérard Roussel to preach freely in Paris, and imprisoned Beda, who raised an outcry against his sermons. At this time (1534) when the Teutonic portion of Christendom was already lost to the papacy, and when Protestantism was winning many adherents even in Italy and Spain, the action of the French king was awaited with eager curiosity and solicitude. The Landgrave of Hesse came to negotiate with him in person. But Francis was in reality opposed to any reformation which struck at the foundations of the Roman Catholic system. He had no sympathy with attacks on the sacraments and the hierarchical body. He would not countenance movements that involved a religious division in his kingdom. He prized the old maxim, "One king, one law, one faith."

The papal party sought in every way to persuade him to espouse their cause. They busily instilled into his mind the idea that a civil revolution would inevitably follow a religious change. But it was not their arguments which finally induced the king to persecute the Protestants. It was the inconsiderate zeal of certain radical reformers who, in October, 1534, posted on the walls along the streets of Paris, and even on the door of the royal bed-chamber at Amboise, placards denouncing the mass.

The placards;
persecution.

The rage of the Parisians was hardly greater than that of the king. He forthwith showed his devotion to the Catholic religion by joining in solemn religious processions, and in the burning, with circumstances of atrocious cruelty, of eighteen heretics. Nevertheless he did not break off his negotiations with the Germans. He even urged Melancthon to come to Paris to take part in a religious conference. He claimed that those who had suffered death were fanatics and seditious people whom regard for the safety of the State rendered it necessary to destroy. But although he continued to assist the cause and cultivate the friendship of the German Protestants, in order to weaken the power of the emperor, his policy towards the French reformers became more and more intolerant. He approved a rigid statement of doctrine, which the Sorbonne put forth in the form of directions to preachers. He even did not interpose to save his unoffending Waldensian subjects from massacre. The result of his attitude in relation to the Reformation was that, a few years after his death, his country was plunged into civil wars, during which it became, "not the arbiter but the prey of Europe," and its soil "the frightful theatre of the battle of sects and nations." From such wars it had no respite until "his dynasty perished in blood and mire."

A few words may here be added respecting the suffering Waldensian Christians. They had never lost the spirit acquired through the influence of Waldo. In 1497 they came into communication with the Bohemian brethren, and received much light and quickening from that source. They cast away the worship of saints and the doctrine of purgatory. Through intercourse with the reformers in Basel and Strassburg, to whom they sent messengers, they were led to discard the doctrine of the seven sacraments, and at a synod, in 1532, to adopt Protestant principles, without openly renouncing the Church of Rome. It was the public profession of their faith that provoked the bloody persecution in Provence in 1545, when twenty-two villages were burned, and four thousand persons were ruthlessly massacred. On the eastern side

The Wal-
denses.

of the Cottian Alps the Waldensian congregations were persecuted, but not broken up. In Calabria, when they received Protestant preachers, their congregations were slaughtered without mercy, such as survived being sold as slaves.

Protestantism, which was first introduced into France under the Lutheran form, soon became Calvinistic through the influence of Geneva. It has been stated on a previous page that from the Genevan printing-offices there were sent forth Bibles and many other books. The reformers received letters of counsel and encouragement from Calvin. Preachers educated under his direction went to the little congregations which were scattered all over the kingdom, and which were especially numerous in the South. As we have already learned, Geneva became more and more the asylum of Frenchmen whom religious intolerance drove from their country. During the reign of Francis I., Protestantism was favorably received by many belonging to the higher classes of society. But while multitudes of men and women, both in and out of the court, had no sympathy with Roman Catholic bigotry, they turned away from Calvinism, demanding as it did so radical an amendment of life.

Henry II., who succeeded his father in 1547, although he entered into a treaty with Maurice of Saxony against the emperor, was no friend of Protestantism. But, notwithstanding the burning of the books and persons of its adherents, the number of Protestants steadily increased. In 1558 it was estimated that they had two thousand places of worship. The following year they held in secrecy a general synod at Paris, where they adopted a Calvinistic confession of faith, and organized the church after the Presbyterian form. But the king was by no means ready to permit such an increase of heresy in his kingdom. In order that he might turn his arms against his own subjects, he concluded a peace with Philip II., on terms humiliating to France. He "bought, at the price of many provinces, the rank of lieutenant of the King of Spain in the Catholic party." He had begun the work of repression by throwing two Parliamentary advocates of a milder policy into the Bastile, when he was accidentally killed in a tournament held in honor of the new marriage-alliances with the Duke of Savoy and the King of Spain. Thus far persecution had failed of its design. "For one martyr who disappeared in the flames, there presented themselves a hundred more; men, women, and children marched to their punishment singing the psalms of Marot or the canticle of Simeon:

Influence of
Geneva.

Henry II.;
progress of
Protestant-
ism.

July 10, 1559.

‘Rappelez votre serviteur,
Seigneur! j’ai vu votre Sauveur.’”

“Most of the victims died with the eye turned towards that New Jerusalem, that holy city of the Alps, where some had been to seek, whence others had received, the word of God. Not a preacher, not a missionary was condemned who did not salute Calvin from afar, thanking him for having prepared him for so beautiful an end. They no more thought of reproaching Calvin for not following them into France than a soldier reproaches his general for not plunging into the *mêlée*.”

The death of Henry II. brought to the throne his son Francis, a boy of sixteen, weak in mind and body. He was completely under the control of his wife, Mary Stuart, and of her uncles the Duke of Guise and the Cardinal of Lorraine, both uncompromising Catholics. The queen-mother, Catharine de Medici, an ambitious and crafty woman, who hoped to maintain her own ascendancy by playing off one party against another, had allied herself to the Guises in order to break the power of the Constable Montmorenci and his family connections of the great houses of Bourbon and Chatillon. The result of this step was that the Protestants were

no longer merely a persecuted sect, but a strong political party, led by princes of the blood and nobles of the highest rank. Of the Bourbon princes one of the most prominent was Anthony of Vendôme, King of Navarre by his marriage with Jeanne d’Albret, daughter of Margaret of Navarre, and another was Louis, Prince of Condé. Of the house of Chatillon the ablest and most honored member was Admiral Coligni. All three of these men had espoused the cause of the Protestants, although not with equal firmness and depth of conviction. Navarre was weak and vacillating, and remained to the last a time-server. Condé was brilliant as a soldier, but was not free from the vices of a courtier. Coligni, one of the heroic figures in French history, was a sagacious statesman, an able general, a man of pure life and earnest piety. It was not to be expected that these men would quietly see the control of the government practically usurped by persons whom they considered upstarts who had seized on places that did not belong to them by the laws and customs of the realm. That under these circumstances they should look to the persecuted Calvinists for support, and that the latter should seek deliverance through them, was natural. They did not desire to throw off their allegiance to the king, but to remove him from the

The Protestants a political party.

influence of his evil counsellors. The only way of doing it was by vigorous and united action. A bold show of force would rid the kingdom of usurpers and save the country from civil war. But this remedy it was impossible to apply. The abortive conspiracy of Amboise, to which Condé alone of the great nobles was privy, terrified Catharine and the Guises, but only for a moment. The harsh edicts of persecution were again renewed. This did not, however, prevent Coligni from presenting to the king, in an assembly of nobles at Fontainebleau, a petition of the Protestants for liberty to meet together to worship. The advocates of a milder policy towards the Huguenots, as the Protestants about this time began to be called, prevailed, and the States-General were summoned to consider the affairs of the kingdom. The Guises now formed a plan for crushing the Huguenot leaders and forcing a rigid conformity to Catholicism on the States-General, and on all officials and pastors throughout the land. The King of Navarre and Condé were enticed to the court at Orleans. Condé was arrested and sentenced to death for complicity in the Amboise conspiracy, and Navarre was surrounded by guards and spies. The cause of Protestantism seemed lost, when suddenly (in December, 1560) the young king died, and the control of the government passed into the hands of Catharine de Medici and of Navarre, the

Charles IX.;
Catharine de
Medici.

guardians of Henry's second son, Charles IX., who was still in his minority. Had Anthony of Navarre been a courageous, or even a self-respecting prince, he would

have demanded the regency, and would have seized on this grand opportunity for introducing a wiser and more humane policy towards the persecuted Huguenots. But he basely surrendered all his authority into the hands of Catharine. And yet the early years of the reign of Charles were marked by a greater degree of toleration and by an evident desire on the part of the queen-mother and her liberal-minded chancellor, L'Hospital, to heal the religious dissensions. In the last few years Protestantism had made progress not only among the lower orders, but also among the wealthy merchants and the nobles. Its largest support was from the intelligent middle class, the artisans in the cities. In spite of the opposition of the Duke of Guise, who was now joined by Montmorenci, and of the intrigues of the pope and of the King of Spain, the hopes of religious union continued to grow brighter. A conference was held at

Colloquy at
Poissy.

Poissy, in the autumn of 1561, between the representatives of both confessions. In the great refectory of the Benedictines the young king sat in the midst of the aristocracy of France,

Catharine de Medici, the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and the great lords and ladies of the court. The Catholics were represented by cardinals, bishops, abbots, and doctors of the Sorbonne. Before this brilliant assembly Theodore Beza and several of the most distinguished of the Huguenot preachers appeared, to set forth

Beza, 1519-1605. the doctrines of the reformers. Beza was a man of noble birth, of fine wit, and polished manners, and had already

won the respect of many of the court whom he had met in social intercourse prior to the public conference. But the breach which separated Catholic and Protestant was too wide to be bridged over by learning and controversial skill. No agreement could be reached on the eucharist. The colloquy, whatever may have been its moral effect, failed to bring about a compromise. Early in the following

Edict of St. Germain, 1562.

year the Edict of St. Germain was issued, which granted a measure of toleration. The Protestants were to show respect to Catholic rites and ceremonies, were to sur-

render the churches of which they had taken possession, and were to build no more. But they might hold their meetings in the open country and enjoy the protection of the police. This concession was welcomed by the Huguenots and by Calvin himself. They hoped to be able, under its shield, to convert the nation, since all such edicts had been given a broad construction. But the Catholic party were not ready to yield even this limited toleration. They seduced the weak King of Navarre into a desertion of the Protestant cause. Thus the union of the princes of the blood and the queen-mother was broken, and the success of L'Hospital's tolerant policy rendered impossible.

At this juncture the massacre of unoffending Huguenot worshippers at Vassy, by the soldiers of the Duke of Guise, and under the

Massacre at Vassy, 1562.

eyes of the duke, plunged the country into civil war. The Protestants throughout France regarded that outrage

as a wanton and atrocious violation of the religious peace, and flew to arms. The Duke of Guise and his associates obtained possession of the king and of Catharine, in order to give the action of their adversaries the appearance of rebellion. Thus began the civil wars, which only ended with the accession of Henry IV. to the throne. The Huguenots acted in self-defence. It was not until the government had proved itself powerless to keep its solemn pledges, and had countenanced the wholesale murder of innocent people, that they rose in rebellion. And even then Coligni took up arms with extreme reluctance, and only persuaded by the tears and entreaties of his wife. In the midst of the war, when the Catholics seemed

about to be victorious, the Duke of Guise was assassinated by a Huguenot, who was moved to this deed, not by the counsel of the leaders of his party, but of his own accord, in the hope of ridding the country of its chief enemy. This first civil war was ended by the Edict of Amboise, whose terms were more favorable to the nobles than to the people. Coligni refused to sanction its provisions, and was equally opposed to Condé's action in concluding the peace of Longjumeau at the close of the second war, in 1568.

Philip II. had for several years been endeavoring to persuade Catharine to adopt the repressive measures which had crushed out Protestantism in Spain, and seemed to be working towards the same end in the Netherlands. The Catholic counter-reformation was in progress, and the Jesuit preachers inflamed the anger of the Catholic population. The queen-mother would not, however, risk her own ascendancy by unreservedly espousing the cause of either party. The treachery of the Catholic leaders brought on the third civil war, during which the brave Condé was slain in the battle of Jarnac. But in spite of the continual reverses which befell the Protestant cause, Coligni was able to keep together his troops and to renew hostilities. With him were the young princes of Navarre—Anthony was dead—and of Condé. At this time the ambitious schemes of Philip II. excited the alarm of the French. They felt that he was taking part in the war against the Huguenots simply to promote his own selfish interests. The court, therefore, notwithstanding the advantages which had been gained over the Protestants, concluded with them the peace of

Peace of St. Germain, 1570.

Fluctuating policy.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

St. Germain, which renewed the peace of Amboise, and left four fortified towns in their hands as a guarantee that the stipulations of the treaty would be fulfilled. Thus France became divided against itself. For a time it seemed as if Catharine would adopt an anti-Spanish policy. Proposals were made for the marriage of one of her sons to Queen Elizabeth of England. A second plan proved more successful. Prince Henry of Navarre was to marry Margaret, the daughter of Catharine, and Condé was to marry a princess of the house of Cleve. So ardent were the hopes of the Protestants that Coligni himself came to the court and was cordially received by Catharine. But this good feeling was not of long duration. She saw that the king was attracted by the noble character of Coligni, and already listened to him with an almost filial docility. Coligni urged a declaration of war against the King

of Spain, and when Catharine opposed this measure warm words passed between them. She feared that Elizabeth would recall her troops from the Netherlands. She could prevent the war by destroying the Huguenot chief. His implacable enemies, the Guises, and the Duke of Anjou, afterward Henry III., eagerly

entered into the plot. But an attempt to assassinate
 August 22,
 1572.

Coligni failed. He was wounded, but not dangerously. The anger of the king was kindled by this act of perfidy, and he visited the wounded veteran. Coligni called him to his bedside and cautioned him against the counsels of Catharine and against the faction to which she had allied herself. The queen-mother herself, who was present, could not hear the conversation, which was carried forward in a low tone, but prevailed upon Charles afterwards to tell her what Coligni had said. She now resolved upon the general massacre of the Huguenots, many of whom had been invited to Paris to attend the wedding festivities. The conspirators filled the mind of the king with stories of plots of the Protestants for his overthrow. When at last he gave way and consented to the murder of Coligni, he demanded, in a frantic tone, that all the Huguenots should be struck down, so that none might be left to cry out against the deed. In the night of August 24th the massacre began. Coligni and other prominent Huguenots were first slain by the Duke of Guise and his associates. Then one of the great bells of the city rang out the signal to the other conspirators. The bigoted Catholic populace were urged on to the work of blood. None were spared; men, women, and children were murdered without mercy. The very seeds of heresy must be destroyed. Couriers were sent through the country, and in other towns the same frightful scenes were enacted. Not less than two thousand were killed in Paris, and as many as twenty thousand in the rest of France. Navarre and Condé were obliged to conform to the Catholic Church to save their lives. When the news of this massacre reached Rome, the pope ordered a *Te Deum* to be sung. It caused a like tumult of joy at Madrid. But in all other countries, both Catholic and Protestant, the atrocious crime was regarded with horror and its perpetrators with execration. If its object was to crush the Protestants, it was a failure. They only gathered new determination

The "Politiques;" the Catholic League, 1576.

from their sufferings. The liberal Catholics, or "Politiques," separated from their fanatical brethren and advocated a policy of toleration. Such was the power of this combined party that, in 1576, Henry III., who, two years before, had succeeded to the throne, granted complete religious toleration

outside of Paris, and equality of rights. The Guise faction, with the aid of Spain, now formed the Catholic League for the maintenance of the Catholic religion and the extirpation of Protestantism. Under its influence the worthless king abandoned his policy of toleration. Civil war again raged in France. After the death of

1584. the Duke of Alençon, Henry of Navarre became heir to the throne. The league, supported by Spain and Rome, determined that he should never wear the crown. In 1586 a third war, that of the "Three Henriess," broke out. The king, wearied

1588. of the domination of the Guises, at length caused both the duke and the cardinal to be assassinated. The hatred of the Catholics was aroused to such fury by this act that he was obliged to take refuge in the camp of Henry of Navarre. But even here he was not safe. He was slain (August 1, 1589) by a fanatical priest, who made his way into the camp.

Henry IV. was now King of France by right of inheritance, but the power of the league stood between him and the throne. Even after its schemes of union with Spain had fallen through, and its army had been defeated by the king at Ivry, the obstacle

March 14, 1590. of religion still remained. Many of the liberal Catholics who had supported Henry's cause would never consent to his wearing the crown until he conformed to the religion of his fathers. In their minds Catholicism and the monarchy were bound up together. There was much to induce Henry to yield to their wishes. Only thus could he put an end to the calamities under which his country was groaning. He, moreover, believed that as king he could shield the Protestants from persecution. Influenced by such considerations he went into the church of St. Denis, and, kneeling before the Archbishop of Bourges, declared that he would live and die in the Catholic Church, which he promised to protect and defend. His views underwent no change. He refused to sign specific articles of faith. His act was simply one of outward conformity. To Coligni such a surrender of principle would have been impossible; but to Henry, brought up in the camp and not free from its vices, and with no deep religious convictions, it might seem even meritorious. The Protestants were thrown into consternation by this step, which seemed to them a betrayal of

The Edict of Nantes. their cause. But Henry was sincere in his purpose to protect them. By the Edict of Nantes, in 1598, they were granted that measure of religious freedom for which they had contended, and several fortified cities were left in their hands as a

guarantee for their security. In Henry's foreign wars their chief enemies, the pope and the King of Spain, were humbled, as well as the ancient boundaries of the realm restored. But although Protestantism thus enjoyed comparative security, it ceased to make progress. Its adherents were no longer animated by a purpose to conquer the whole country to their faith. They became a defensive party, burdened with the necessity of maintaining a political and a military establishment as a protection against their enemies.

CHAPTER V.

THE REFORMATION IN THE NETHERLANDS.

IN the Netherlands, which were nearly co-extensive with the territory at present included in Belgium and Holland, and which formed a most valuable portion of the great realm of Charles V.,

Protestantism spread rapidly, in spite of the persecutions to which its adherents were early subjected. The spirit and occupations of the people, the whole atmosphere of

the country, were singularly favorable to the reception of the evangelical doctrine. They were sober, industrious, and liberty-loving. Their intelligence was so remarkable that common laborers, even fishermen who dwelt in the huts of Friesland, could read and write, and discuss the interpretation of Scripture. The nearness of the Low Countries to Germany, to England, and to France, facilitated the introduction of the new opinions. "Nor did the Rhine from Germany, or the Meuse from France," to quote the regretful language of the Jesuit historian Strada, "send more water into the Low Countries, than by the one the contagion of Luther, and by the other that of Calvin, was imported into the same Belgic provinces." As the number of Protestants increased, and the influence of France and of Geneva began to be felt, the Lutheran type of

Calvinism ; teaching gave way to Calvinism. Anabaptists and other
persecution. licentious and fanatical sectaries were numerous, and their excesses afforded a plausible pretext for punishing with severity all who departed from the ancient faith. But the first edict, or "placard," for the suppression of heresy in the Netherlands, and several of those which followed, were imperfectly executed on account of the lenient disposition of the regents to whom Charles delegated the government during his protracted absence. In 1550, however, the country was alarmed by the issuing of another "pla-

card," not only renewing the former edicts, but containing, besides, a reference to inquisitors of the faith, as well as to the ordinary judges of the bishops. The people feared that the terrible Spanish Inquisition was to be introduced. Foreign merchants prepared to leave Antwerp, prices fell, and trade was to a great extent suspended. At the intercession of the regent the emperor substituted "ecclesiastical judges" for inquisitors of the faith. Although the persecuting edicts were not carried out during the long reign of Charles with all the severity which their provisions demanded, many thousands were put to death as heretics.

In 1555 the government of the Netherlands devolved upon Philip II., who had succeeded his father on the throne of Spain.

Philip II. The main article of the new monarch's creed was political and religious absolutism. He was inexorably hostile to all deviations from the established faith. He valued the interests of the Church of Rome above everything except objects of his own selfish ambition. In the Netherlands he was as much disliked as his father had been loved. Charles had been careful to refrain from any direct attack on the ancient privileges of the Belgic provinces, but Philip resolved to introduce the same arbitrary system there which had crushed the liberties of Spain. By his obstinate attempt to carry out this plan he raised up new allies for the cause of the persecuted reformers, and brought on the revolt of the Netherlands, out of which, in the North, arose a new Protestant state.

The spirit of
resistance.

His choice of a regent irritated the aristocracy, and especially its leaders, Count Egmont and William of Orange. Both these men had rendered distinguished services to the emperor, and to the king himself, which gave them a claim on Philip's gratitude. Egmont was a nobleman of brilliant qualities; the Prince of Orange, the future liberator of his country, was a sagacious statesman. Philip not only passed over them and chose Margaret of Parma, his half-sister, as regent, but placed the chief conduct of affairs in the hands of Granvelle, an ecclesiastic who was devoted to his policy, and who, in 1561, was made cardinal. Not long afterwards, the people as well as the nobles became disaffected because of the continued presence of Spanish troops in the land, and because of the creation of several new bishoprics. The latter measure, although it was justified to some extent by the smallness of the number of bishops to whom the ecclesiastical affairs of the country were committed, was evidently a part of the machinery to be employed for tightening the cords of Church discipline, and for the extermination of heresy. This policy was re-

pugnant to the general feeling of the people—even of the Catholic population. Public opinion was on the side of freedom and against the forcible suppression of religious dissent. It was the spirit of patriotism far more than personal ambition which induced the great nobles, like Egmont and William of Orange, to resist the political and ecclesiastical tyranny of Philip.

Notwithstanding the wide acceptance which Protestantism had gained, and the profound dissatisfaction which the persecuting policy of Charles had stirred up, the former edicts were
Renewed persecution. now renewed in all their rigor. It was declared heretical for a layman to read even the Bible. Every incentive was held out to informers to practise their iniquitous business. Intercession in behalf of the accused was visited with severe penalties. The Inquisition which Charles had established, and Philip confirmed, in order that these measures might be enforced, was not only independent of the clergy, but had jurisdiction over them, from the highest to the lowest. The indignation of the people at the continued beheading, burning, and burying alive of multitudes of their fellow-countrymen, directed itself against Granvelle, the king's minister. But even after his removal the work of the Inquisition was pushed forward with still more relentless zeal. The nobles who were members of the council, powerless though they were, felt that they were in part answerable for these cruelties; and when Philip determined to promulgate the decrees of Trent, the Prince of Orange startled the council by a powerful speech upon the unrighteous and dangerous policy which the government was pursuing. Egmont went to Spain, only to be deceived by the vain promises of the king. Many of the nobles now resolved upon a more open resistance. About five hundred of them united in an agreement

“The Compromise.”

called the Compromise, to withstand the Spanish tyranny and the Inquisition. Although the great lords stood aloof, Count Louis of Nassau, who was more radical than his brother, William of Orange, joined the league. Its members called themselves “the beggars,” a name which had been contemptuously applied to them by one of the counsellors of the regent. At this time great crowds, protected by armed men, began to assemble in the open country to hear the Calvinist preachers, and to worship according to their own preference. Margaret found herself powerless to resist the popular movement. Even the king seemed about to relax the obnoxious edicts, but only that he might lull the people into a false security while he should more stealthily prepare the way for their final subjugation.

While the country was in this excited state, in the summer of 1566 a storm of iconoclasm raged from one end of the land to the other. Mobs, exasperated by persecution, broke into cathedrals and churches, and destroyed pictures and images, and everything which ministered to what they thought the idolatries of the Catholic worship. This image-breaking was denounced by Protestant ministers, and by the Prince of Orange, and other leaders of the liberal party. It could not but alienate the sympathies of many earnest Catholics who had hitherto supported the patriotic cause. Although the country was soon reduced to quiet, through the efforts of Prince William and Count Egmont, Philip resolved to take vengeance upon all who had in any way hindered the restoration of the authority of the Church. He sent to the Netherlands, at the head of ten thousand soldiers, the Duke of Alva, a skilful general, and a man of the same crafty and merciless nature as the king himself. It was his purpose to crush the spirit of resistance in the Netherlands by destroying the great nobles. William had wisely retired to his ancestral estates, but Counts Egmont and Horn, blind to their danger, still remained. They were thrown into prison, and soon after were beheaded. Alva erected a "Council of Disturbances," which the people more appropriately named the "Council of Blood." The executioners were busy from morning till night. Victims were especially sought among the rich, that the coffers of the king might be filled. When the counsellors grew weary of sentencing individuals, so great was the number, they finally, on February 16, 1568, condemned to death as heretics all the inhabitants of the Netherlands, with a few exceptions that were named. But after it was found that Alva's policy, in spite of his successes in the field, did not accomplish its purpose, counsels of lenity began to prevail. In 1570 an act of amnesty was solemnly proclaimed at Antwerp, which, although it left all the edicts in force, ordained that those against whom nothing was to be charged should go unpunished, provided within a definite time they should sue for grace and obtain absolution from the Church.

The struggle went on. The Prince of Orange labored unceasingly to defend the cause of his people. In 1572 Briel was captured by the "sea-beggars," as the hardy seamen of Holland and Zealand were called, and the foundations of the Dutch Republic were laid through the adoption of a free constitution by these provinces in accordance with the suggestions of William of Orange. Philip, however, was still in form recog-

Iconoclasm.

Cruelties of Alva.

Rise of the Dutch Republic.

nized as king. The hatred against Alva grew daily more intense. In 1573 he was succeeded by Requesens, whose conciliatory temper was more dangerous to the liberties of the Netherlands than the bloody deeds of Alva had been. But the success of the new regent was confined to the South, where Catholicism had at length prevailed. At his death a frightful revolt of his soldiers led the nobles of Flanders and Brabant to seek a union with the Northern provinces in the Pacification of Ghent. Don John, the successor of Requesens, was obliged to acquiesce in this arrangement. But William, dissatisfied with the limited measure of toleration which it granted and distrusting Spanish promises, refused to accept its terms. War broke out again. As usual, the Spaniards were victorious in the field under Don John, and Alexander of Parma, who followed him in the regency. Nevertheless, in January, 1579, the seven Northern provinces formed the Utrecht Union, which was the germ of the Dutch Republic. Philip, the next year, declared William an outlaw and set a price upon his head. After six attempts had failed, a fanatical Catholic assassinated him on the 18th of July, 1584. But William's work was done. He had delivered his fellow-countrymen from the Spanish yoke. Although the Southern provinces, after the Utrecht union, accepted the terms of Alexander, and agreed that the Protestants must either leave the country within two years or become Catholics, the Republic which William had created in the North continued to increase in strength and prosperity. Under Philip III., Spain was obliged to conclude a truce with it, and finally, in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), was compelled to acknowledge its independence.

The Calvinists, although themselves the subjects of bitter persecution, did not give up the doctrine that heresy should be punished

Intolerance
of Protest-
ants.

by the magistrate. The question on which they and Philip were divided was how heresy was to be defined.

But they were incapable of exercising such inhuman cruelty as it was his constant delight to practise. To the Prince of Orange and a part of his followers belongs the distinction of having demanded an equal toleration towards all, even towards the Anabaptists. And the Calvinists themselves, in the last years of their struggle with the King of Spain, learned that "by reason of their sins they could not all be reduced to one and the same religion."

The relation of the church to the civil authority was a question which caused divisions in the reformed party. Some were for maintaining the Genevan idea that the Church is independent of the

State. Others, and among them was William of Orange, believed that the civil authority should have power in the appointment of ministers and in the administration of the Church. The result of the controversy was that the Church was limited to a provincial organization, the provinces being subdivided into classes, and each congregation being governed according to the Presbyterian order.

CHAPTER VI.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

THE Reformation in England—especially in its earlier stages—compared with the Reformation on the Continent, was, in the large sense of the term, of a political character. It was the severance of the English monarchy from its connection with the Church of Rome. The ecclesiastical changes that took place were such as would naturally result from this declaration of national independence. At the outset, they touched neither dogma nor rite, and affected polity only to a limited extent. In shaping the new system, the personal authority, the policy and preferences, of the Tudor sovereigns had a predominant influence. Theological principles, however, were involved from the start, and we find that doctrinal and religious elements mingled, with an ever-growing efficiency, in the process which gradually transformed England into a Protestant nation. No definite agency can be attributed to the Lollards, although we read of groups meeting in secret to read together the Gospels in English. It is clear that the seed sown by Wyclif had not ceased to bear fruit, in particular among the rustic population in the North of England. There remained, as an effect of his labors, a greater acquaintance of the people with the contents of the Bible. The new learning prepared the ground for distinctively Protestant opinions to spring up, and to spread in the educated class. The younger Humanists did not halt at the point to which they had been led by Colet and More; and the liberal patronage extended to scholarship by Wolsey paved the way for radical departures from the mediæval creed. The writings of Luther early found approving readers among young men at Oxford and Cambridge. William Tyndale, who studied at both universities, conceived the design to give to the common people the Bible in their own tongue. “If God spare my life,” he said to a polemical divine, “I will cause a boy

Church and State.
Character of the English Reformation.

Its causes.

1484-1536.

that driveth the plough shall know more of the Scripture than thou dost." He lived long enough to fulfil his purpose. Another young

c. 1503-1533. man, John Frith, having taken his degree at Cambridge,

was invited by Wolsey to Cardinal College (now Christ Church), at Oxford. He was imprisoned as a heretic, but was released by Wolsey, escaped to the Continent, and joined Tyndale at Antwerp, which for a while was a place of rendezvous for a few young English scholars whose hearts were bent on planting the Lutheran doctrine in their native country. Both Tyndale and Frith were destined to die for the cause for which they labored.

"A young king, about eighteen years of age, for stature, strength, making, and beauty, one of the goodliest persons of his time. And although he were given to pleasure, yet he

Henry VIII.

was likewise desirous of glory ; so that there was a passage open in his mind by glory for virtue. Neither was he unendowed with learning, though therein he came short of his brother Arthur." These are the words of Lord Bacon respecting Henry VIII., who, in 1509, succeeded his father, the seventh Henry, by whose marriage to the daughter of Edward IV. the houses of Lancaster and York had been united. His son was "the first heir of the white and of the red rose." At that time everything favored royal authority. The civil wars had thinned the ranks and brought down the strength of the nobility. The young monarch, besides the personal advantages which made him popular with his subjects, inherited the treasure which his father had accumulated. He brought to the throne an unbounded self-will, an obstinacy of character on which arguments and entreaties were as feathers falling on a rock. It was natural that he should look across the channel, and crave for himself an absolute power such as he saw exercised by Francis I. He owed his crown to the early death of his brother Arthur, whose widow, Catharine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand, and consequently the aunt of Charles V., Henry was enabled to marry through a dispensation obtained by Henry VII. from Pope Julius II.—marriage with the wife of a deceased brother being forbidden by the laws of the Church. Henry was in his twelfth year when the marriage was concluded, but it was not consummated until the death of his father. In the rivalry between Spain and France, the two great competitors for power and dominion in Europe, Henry was drawn, by the prompt-

His foreign
policy.

ings of ambition, as well as by hereditary antagonism to France, to the side of Charles V.; and from this position he was not decoyed by the splendid festivities of the "Field of the

Cloth of Gold," where, in June, 1520, he passed three weeks in the company of the French king. Wolsey, raised to the cardinalate by the agency of Charles, and encouraged by him in his ambitious hope to succeed to the papacy, was strongly interested to maintain the alliance. But in the wars that ensued between Charles and Francis the English gradually discerned that they were expending their blood and money with no substantial gain. The promotion to the papacy, first of Adrian VI. and then of Clement VII., was one principal cause that moved Wolsey to withdraw his master from an ally who made to neither of them any compensation for their services. In 1527 Henry and Francis agreed to combine for the expulsion of the imperialists from Italy. The question of Henry's

The divorce question. divorce from Catharine soon became a subject of discussion, and the effort to procure the annulling of the marriage from the pope was prosecuted for a number of years. Henry professed, and perhaps with sincerity, that he had long been troubled with doubts of the validity of the marriage, as being contrary to the divine law, and therefore not within the limit of the pope's dispensing power. The death of a number of his children, leaving only a single daughter, Mary, had been interpreted by some as a mark of the displeasure of God. At the same time the English people, in the fresh recollection of the long dynastic struggle, were anxious on account of the lack of a male heir to the throne. On the queen's side it was asserted that it was competent for the pope to authorize a marriage with a brother's widow, and that no doubt could possibly exist in the present case, since, according to her testimony, her marriage with Arthur had never been completed. The eagerness of Henry to procure the divorce increased with his growing passion for Anne Boleyn. The negotiations with Rome dragged slowly on. Catharine was six years older than himself, and had lost her charms. He was enamored of this young English girl, fresh from the court of France. He resolved to break the marriage bond with the Spanish princess who had been his faithful wife for nearly twenty years. It was not without reason that the king became more and more incensed at the dilatory and vacillating course of the pope. The latter was naturally loath to condemn the act of his predecessor, and thereby at the same time to curtail the papal prerogative, and was equally reluctant to offend the emperor. When the pope was at variance with Charles, Cardinal Campeggio was appointed, in conjunction with Wolsey, who was possessed of legatine authority, to judge of the matter in England. Campeggio made delays in the hearing of the case, and the recon-

ciliation of Charles with Clement was followed by the avocation of the cause to Rome. This proceeding exhausted the king's patience. Henry determined to lay the question of the validity of his marriage before the universities of Europe, and this he did, making a free use of bribery abroad and of menaces at home. Meantime, he took measures to cripple the authority of the pope and of the clergy in England. In these proceedings he was sustained by a popular feeling, the growth of centuries, against foreign ecclesiastical interference and clerical control in civil affairs. The fall of Wolsey was the effect of his failure to procure the divorce, and of the enmity of Anne Boleyn and her family. Even Campeggio's artful delays had been wrongfully imputed to his associate. In order to convict of treason this minister, whom he had raised to the highest pinnacle of power, the king did not scruple to avail himself of the ancient statute of *præmunire*, which Wolsey was accused of having transgressed by acting as the pope's legate in England—it was dishonestly alleged, without the royal license. Early in 1531 the king charged the whole body of the clergy with having incurred the penalties of the same law by submitting to Wolsey in

Submission of the clergy. his legatine character. Assembled in convocation, they were obliged to implore his pardon, and obtained it only in return for a large sum of money. In their petition he was styled, in obedience to his dictation, "The Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England," to which was added, after long debate, at the suggestion of Archbishop Warham—"as far as is permitted by the law of Christ." The Church, prostrate though it was at the feet of the despotic king, showed some degree of self-respect in inserting this amendment. Parliament

Anti-papal measures. forbade the introduction of papal bulls into England.

The king was authorized, if he saw fit, to withdraw the annats—first-fruits of benefices—from the pope. Appeals to Rome were forbidden. The retaliatory measures of Henry did not move the pontiff to recede from his position. On or about January 25, 1533, the king was privately married to Anne Boleyn. In his battle with the pope, Henry had been aided by the counsels and support of Thomas Cranmer, who advised the resort to the universities and assured him that the authorities at home were fully competent to adjudicate finally the question of divorce. After the death of Warham, Cranmer, on March 30, 1533, was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury. Eleven weeks after the private marriage of Henry, the new archbishop was authorized and directed to pronounce judgment on the matter of the divorce, without fear or favor. The

marriage with Catharine was declared by him and his assessors (in May, 1533) unlawful from the beginning. In 1534 Henry was conditionally excommunicated by Clement VII. The papal decree deposing him from the throne, and absolving his subjects from their allegiance, did not follow until 1538, and was issued by Paul III. Clement's bull was sent forth on the 23d of March. On the 23d

of November Parliament passed the Act of Supremacy, without the qualifying clause which the clergy had attached to their vote. The king was, moreover, clothed with full power and authority to repress and amend all such errors, heresies, and abuses as "by any manner of spiritual authority or jurisdiction ought or may lawfully be reformed." Thus a visitatorial function of vast extent was recognized as belonging to him. In 1532 convocation was driven to engage not "to enact or promulge or put in execution" any measures without the royal license, and to promise to change or to abrogate any of the "provincial constitutions" which he should judge inconsistent with his prerogative. The clergy were thus stripped of all power to make laws. A mixed commission, which Parliament ordained for the revision of the whole canon law, was not appointed in this reign.

The dissolution of the king's marriage thus dissolved the union of England with the papacy. Such a revolution could not have been effected had not Henry been backed by a strong national feeling. Yet the overmastering will of the monarch seems to have cast a spell on all orders of men, and to have paralyzed whatever spirit of resistance might naturally have been evoked. Parliament was quick to formulate whatever demands he chose to make for the expansion of his authority. The clergy were reduced to abject submission, and helplessly surrendered all power of independent action. It is to the credit of convocation that it ventured to qualify its assent to the king's supremacy over the Church, and managed to hinder a complete abolition of the existing canon law. Cowed as the clergy were after the disgrace of Wolsey, the measures by which the Anglican hierarchy were separated from Rome flowed from the concurrent action of convocation and Parliament. It is not the less true, however, that the clergy acted under compulsion. That the civil ruler might be supreme over the "spiritualty" as well as the "temporality," over clergy as well as laity, was a mode of settling the controversy between the empire and the papacy which had been suggested in contests in the middle ages. At first, Cranmer, and numerous ecclesiastics with him, pushed the conception of the king's head-

Act of
Supremacy.

Meaning of
the king's
supremacy.

ship so far as to express the opinion (in 1540) that appointment by a Christian ruler, without ordination, is all that is necessary to qualify a clergyman for the exercise of his spiritual functions. But the government, in passing the Act of Supremacy, drew up a document in which that act is declared to signify that the sovereign has only "such power as to a king of right appertaineth by the law of God ; and not that he should take any spiritual power from spiritual ministers that is given to them by the gospel." Under Elizabeth (in 1559), it was expressly proclaimed that the possessors of the crown do not "challenge authority and power of ministry of divine service in the Church." This is substantially the view presented in both of the publications issued by authority for the instruction of the people, the "Institution of a Christian Man," and the "Necessary Doctrine and Erudition of a Christian Man." The king's authority empowers the clergy to perform acts within his realm for which the Church has qualified them. In the making of Church laws, convocation, nominally at least, retained its power, subject to his permission to exercise it, and to his ratification of what was done. Bishops, nominally chosen by the chapters, were really appointed by the king ; and no check was now to be feared from any source upon the exercise of this prerogative. There is no doubt that Henry himself was disposed to give as wide as possible an extension to the powers conferred on him in relation to the spirituality. Stubbs, in his learned work on the "Constitutional History of England," refers to the dialogue between Reginald Fitz Urse and Thomas à Becket just before his murder. In reply to the question from whom he had the archbishopric, Thomas answered, "The spirituals I have from God and my lord the pope, the temporals and possessions from my lord the king." "Do you not," asked Reginald, "acknowledge that you hold the whole from the king?" "No" was the prelate's answer, "we have to render to the king the things that are the king's, and to God the things that are God's." "The words of the archbishop embody the commonly received idea ; the words of Reginald, although they do not represent the theory of Henry II., contain the germ of the doctrine which was formulated by Henry VIII." Henry VIII., it is worth while to add, not only pillaged the magnificent shrine of Becket, but had him accused as a rebel, cited to appear, condemned, his bones burnt, and the ashes thrown into the air. The theories brought forward as the basis for the headship of the king lose their appearance of novelty to one acquainted with the writings of the school of Occam, especially the works of Marsilius of Padua.

1536.

1543.

In two conspicuous instances there was a disapprobation of the king's final rupture with the papacy. In May, 1532, the chancellor, Sir Thomas More, pleading weakness of health, resigned his office. Warham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, just before his death, when he was too ill to use a pen, dictated a protest against all the acts of Parliament in derogation of the rights of the pope, or limiting the rights of the Church or of his own sec. The king, in his purpose to absorb in himself all that allegiance which the clergy had rendered in times past to the pope, had a competent and willing servant in Thomas Cromwell, whom he made vicar-general, a title soon changed to "vicegerent" in ecclesiastical affairs. Cromwell advanced with rapid strides to the highest honors in the State. His early history is not well ascertained. Even the precise year of his birth is not known. He had been much in different countries on the Continent, sometimes as a trader, and for a while as a soldier. He sojourned in different places in Italy. Finally, he entered the service of Wolsey, and did efficient work for him in gathering in the property of the confiscated monasteries, with which the munificent cardinal endowed his colleges. He won praise by not deserting his master at his downfall, although it is not certain that, under the circumstances, he really incurred risk by anything that he did at this crisis. Henry found in him an able man, as subservient as he was energetic, on whom he could rely in the task of bringing the Church and the clergy into helpless subjection to his will, as Parliament had already been reduced to servile obedience.

England stood, in the religious controversy of the age, in an intermediate position. There were two parties, side by side, in the bishoprics and in the council. Tyndale's noble translation of the New Testament, the basis of subsequent Protestant English versions, was issued in a fifth edition in 1529, and his translation of the Pentateuch was printed in 1530. In spite of legal prohibitions, very numerous copies of Tyndale's New Testament were brought into England. There was an eager, widespread desire among the people to obtain and to read the Scriptures. By such influences the new party—the party in favor of doctrinal changes in the direction of Lutheranism—was becoming more and more numerous and aggressive. The policy of Cromwell made him, as far as such a course was judged to be safe and prudent, an upholder of it. Its leader among the clergy was the primate, Cranmer. He had been sent to Germany to forward the cause of the divorce, and had there married a niece

Warham's
protest.

Cromwell.

Two parties.

Cranmer,
1489-1556.

of the Lutheran theologian, Osiander. By a previous marriage (about 1514) he had forfeited his fellowship at Jesus College, which was restored to him on the death of his wife. There can be but little doubt that when he accepted—with reluctance—the archbishopric, he was inclined to Lutheran opinions. Cranmer was a well-trained theologian, naturally disposed to peace and compromise, partly from a certain timidity and diffidence, which were said to have been developed in childhood by the harsh treatment of a school-master. Connected with this pacific temper was an innate pliancy of character which made him incapable of withstanding the demands of so imperious a sovereign as Henry VIII. When sustained by the supreme authority, he could act with vigor as well as intelligence, and from laudable motives; but the absence of heroic elements in his nature fitted him best, as Ranke has observed, “to save a cause in difficult circumstances for a more favorable time.” His purpose ran in one direction, that of religious enlightenment and reform. Often it was stayed or turned aside by a will that bore down his feeble powers of opposition. It resumed its course the moment the obstacle was removed. Latimer, who became Bishop of Worcester, was made of sterner stuff. He could speak with boldness before the face of the king. On the other side was Thomas Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, who upheld the king’s supremacy, but was a consistent and resolute adherent of the old theology, as he proved afterwards, in the next reign, by his willingness to suffer for it. It was Gardiner who called Erasmus “the odious bird” which had laid the egg hatched by Luther.

Impugners of the king’s supremacy and deniers of transubstantiation were alike adjudged to death. The life of Frith might have

been spared, but the manuscript of a “lytle treatise” by

Martyrs.

him, on the sacraments, which was favorable to the Swiss doctrine, fell into the hands of the authorities, and he was burnt at Smithfield in 1533. He was only thirty years of age. Cranmer, who, like Cromwell, had previously advocated a lenient treatment of him, participated in this act. Tyndale, whom Henry VIII. had pursued with malignant industry, was strangled and burnt at Antwerp in 1536. On the other hand, Carthusian monks were dragged from the Tower to Tyburn, and hanged in their robes. Thomas More, who had caused the arrest of Frith, and the venerable Bishop Fisher, were sent to the block as guilty of high treason, although they simply refused to swear to the *preamble* of the statute under which they were condemned, and thus to affirm the invalidity of the king’s marriage with Catharine. The execution

of a man so eminent for his virtues as More, made the impression, at home and abroad, that the English ruler was resolved not to spare the most moderate opponents of his system, even if it were required to introduce a reign of terror. More was beheaded in 1535. At just this time, the king inclined towards the Protestant party. He felt the need of standing in friendly relations with the German Protestant powers, who, in anticipation of a struggle with Charles V., had entered into the Smalcaldic League.

Henry and
the Germans.

More than once he invited Melancthon to England. After continued efforts of Cranmer, seconded by Cromwell, in 1539

"The Great
Bible."

the English Bible was issued, having on the title-page the inscription, issuing from the king's mouth: "Thy word is a lantern unto my feet." It was the result of a revision of a Bible printed in 1537, by John Rogers, under the name of T. Matthew. It was in fact Coverdale's revision of his own Bible and that of Tyndale. Thus Henry, three years after he had procured the death of Tyndale, scattered broadcast over England the work which had cost the martyr his life. More, who, as Lutheranism spread, had grown more and more conservative and intolerant, had written against Tyndale. More complained that he had put "congregation" for "church," "love" for "charity," and "seniors" for "priests." But the last rendering he himself, before More's objection was heard, amended by using the word "elders." These peculiarities in Tyndale's work helped to excite wrath against it and against its author. In 1536—soon after the execution of

The Ten Ar-
ticles.

Anne Boleyn and the king's marriage to Jane Seymour—ten doctrinal articles were adopted, at his command, by the Southern convocation, and every man in the kingdom was required to accept them. The Bible and the three ancient creeds were made the standard of doctrine. Salvation, it was declared, is by faith and without human merit; but there is a necessity for good works. The sacrament of the altar is cautiously defined, but in terms which Luther would not have rejected. The use of images, and various other ceremonies, auricular confession, and the invocation of saints, are approved, but cautions are inserted against the abuse of these practices. The existence of purgatory is recognized, but the power of the pope to deliver souls from it, and kindred superstitions, are

Suppression
of the mon-
asteries.

denied. The two great acts for the suppression of the monasteries, the first in 1535, and the second four years later, were planned and carried into execution by Cromwell. They placed an immense amount of ecclesiastical property at the disposition of the monarch. A minor portion was devoted to the endowment of new bishoprics and of cathedrals. The nobles

and gentry acquired a vast accession of landed property at cheap rates, and were thus put under bonds to stand by the newly established royal supremacy. The coffers of the king were replenished ; but, fortunately for English liberty, the treasure thus gained by the crown was swiftly squandered, so that parliamentary government in later times could not be dispensed with. The mitred abbots were excluded from the Upper House, and the ascendancy in that body was left in the hands of the lay lords. These measures stimulated a Catholic reaction. A rebellion in the North was suppressed ; but the king was turning now in favor of the Anti-Protestant party. In 1539, against the wishes of Cranmer and of Cromwell, the Six

The Six Articles.
cles.

Articles were framed into a statute. These decreed transubstantiation, the needlessness of communion in both kinds, the celibacy of the clergy, the obligation of vows of chastity, the necessity and value of private masses, and of auricular confession. Latimer declined to accept the Articles, and was placed in confinement. The primate bowed to the storm, and sent his wife, whom he had with him at Lambeth, to Germany. He had been bold in objecting to the new creed, but he made no further resistance when it was passed, and he did not forfeit the king's favor. The fall of Cromwell soon followed. He had governed England, subject to his royal master, with absolute authority. He had sent abbots and monks, as well as civilians of the highest rank, to the scaffold. His scheme had been to combine all the Protestant powers and France, with England at the head, in a grand league against the emperor and the pope. In the furtherance of this plan he had pursued negotiations—at times without the knowledge of Henry—with German princes. At length he led the king into a contract of marriage with Anne of Cleves, the sister-in-law of the Elector of Saxony, who, on her arrival in England, proved to be so unlike Holbein's portrait, and so distasteful to him in her looks and person, that he soon obtained from convocation an annulling of the marriage bond. The wrath of the king at the deceit which, as he conceived, had been practised on him in this matter, turned the scales in favor of Gardiner and the numerous enemies of the minister. Cromwell

Fall of Crom-
well.

was arrested for high treason on the 10th of June, 1540, and, notwithstanding the intercession of Cranmer, and his own passionate supplications for mercy, was beheaded on the 28th of the following July. His character remains an unsolved problem. By one class of historians he is made to be an unscrupulous knave ; by another he is credited with religious sincerity, and a broad, statesmanlike policy. To the close of the reign, al-

though the king and the persecuting faction were not directly resisted, Cranmer labored to do what he could to promote the instruction of the clergy and the improvement of worship. The years that intervened between the execution of Cromwell and the death of Henry were eventful in the history of Protestantism. In 1541 the Conferences took place in Germany, which were efforts for the reunion of the churches. Charles V., for the time, was driven by the political situation to what seemed a middle position between Lutheranism and the extreme demands of the papacy. The fall of Cromwell may have been connected with such hopes of reunion in the minds of Henry and of his conservative counsellors—a reunion which, it was expected, would include no practical relinquishment of the royal supremacy. The death of James V. of Scotland opened a prospect of union between the crowns of England and Scotland. A treaty was made for the marriage of the infant, Mary Stuart, with Edward, the king's son. This plan was overthrown by Cardinal Beaton and the partisans of France in Scotland. The result was an

1543. alliance with Charles V., and an attack by England on Scotland and France. Charles, alarmed at the rapid progress of Protestantism, made war on the Smalcaldic League, which had preferred an alliance with France to the alliance offered in 1545 by Henry, who saw in the proceedings of the Council of Trent no course open to him but to fall back on the foreign policy of Cromwell. He considered political independence (including his own absolute authority) and religious uniformity as the two things to be secured at all hazards. He looked upon England in his last days, and saw the ferment of inquiry and debate which the reading of the Bible and the great controversy of the age had produced. Shortly before he died, in an address to Parliament, he complains, not without a touch of pathos, that "there never was more dissension and lack of love between man and man, the occasions whereof are opinions only and names devised for the countenance of the same." The remedy, strange as may seem the prescription from such a source, is declared to be charity. "Therefore," he says—no doubt with sincerity—"be in charity one with another like brother and brother." "I am very sorry," he adds, "to know and hear how unreverently that precious jewel, the word of God, is disputed, rimed, sung, and jangled in every alehouse and tavern." In the reaction after Cromwell's death, certain restrictions had been laid on the reading of the Scriptures, which had proved so fruitful of contention, and, it was maintained, of irreverence.

Last years of
Henry VIII.

Edward VI. was less than ten years old at his accession in 1547, but as an example of mental precocity he has seldom, if ever, been surpassed. He was piously attached to the Protestant faith. The force of Henry's character, his favorable situation in relation to foreign powers, the enormous wealth gained by the suppression of the religious houses, and the support of the numerous class who were zealous for neither of the clashing creeds, enabled him to maintain a Church which was neither Catholic nor

Edward VI.

Protestant
rule.

Protestant. To hold the two parties under this restraint was no longer possible. Somerset, the king's maternal uncle, made his way to supreme control in the regency, and was appointed protector and governor of the realms. The spoliation of Church property for the profit of individuals, in which he was conspicuous, gave just offence. Anxious to carry out the scheme of Henry VIII., for the marriage of the young Queen Mary of Scotland to Edward, and desirous of uniting the two countries in one great Protestant power, he invaded Scotland; but, though his arms were successful, the antipathy of the Scots to English rule was too strong to be overcome, and Mary was taken to France, there to be married to the Dauphin. A Catholic rebellion broke out in Cornwall and Devonshire, and there was another revolt near Norwich. The insurrections were suppressed; but the hostility to Somerset, which was aggravated by his agency in bringing his brother, as guilty of treason, to the block, brought upon him the same fate. Warwick, who was made Duke of Northumberland, his principal enemy, now stood at the head of affairs. He concluded a treaty with France, in which the project of a marriage of Edward with Mary was virtually renounced. The misrule of Northumberland was not even attended with the religious sincerity which had been a merit of Somerset. "The system of despotism which Cromwell built up had been seized by a knot of adventurers, and with German and Italian mercenaries at their disposal, they rode roughshod over the land." Not only among the adversaries of Protestantism, but, also, in the nation at large, there was an irritation which nothing but the terror inspired by the oligarchy of new nobles that held the reins of power, prevented from breaking forth in open rebellion.

It was during this season of peril and confusion that the formularies of the Protestant Church of England were framed. The Six

Framing of
the formu-
laries.

Articles were repealed. The hands of Cranmer, who was now ready to avow the distinct Protestantism into which he had drifted, were strengthened by foreign theologians from the continent, whom he hospitably received at

Lambeth. He brought over Peter Martyr and Ochino, the first of whom was made professor of theology at Oxford in 1549. Martin Bucer was called to the same office at Cambridge. The counsels and presence of Melanchthon—who, after Bucer's death, was invited to fill the chair of divinity at Cambridge—were sought in earnest letters of the primate. It was remarked as a sign of the new order of things that Cranmer ate meat openly in his dining-hall during Lent. Pictures and images were ordered to be taken out of the churches. Homilies were appointed to be read in the churches on Sunday. Positive laws enforcing celibacy were repealed. Convocation and Parliament directed that the communion should be administered in both kinds. The formal abandonment of transubstantiation, the second great step in the English Reformation, was soon to take place. A new "Order of Communion" was issued, which was superseded, in 1548, by the "Book of Common Prayer." Thenceforward Latin services were to cease. The basis of this manual of worship was the old service-books, especially those of Salisbury (Sarum). There were additions from Protestant sources, including passages from the order of service prepared by Melanchthon and Bucer for Hermann, Archbishop of Cologne; and some aid was derived from the liturgies of the French and German refugees in England. It was not long before changes in the Prayer Book, to give it a more decidedly Protestant stamp, were demanded. The influence of the foreign divines was cast in this direction. The simple forms of the foreign congregations, which were permitted to have their own mode of worship in England, were not without effect. The king was urgent for such alterations. The Prayer Book, in the revised form, without being submitted to convocation, was issued in 1552, when the use of consecrated oil, prayers for the dead, and auricular confession were abolished. In the same year the Articles were framed, at first forty-two in number. The main source of the Articles was the Augsburg Confession; but the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist was abandoned. Among Protestants the Lord's Supper was the one engrossing theme of inquiry and controversy. In Switzerland, on this subject, Bullinger, the successor of Zwingli, and a moderate and sensible theologian, and the other Zwinglian pastors, came to an agreement with Calvin, which was expressed in the Zurich Confession. The earlier extreme statements of Zwingli had been somewhat qualified by himself in later additional explanations. The Swiss doctrine now stood opposed to the Lutheran opinion. In the interval between the framing of

The Prayer
Book.

The Articles
of Religion.

the Prayer Book and its revision, the primate himself had passed over to the distinct adoption of the Swiss view. Referring back to the beginning of Edward's reign, he himself says: "I was in that error of the real presence"—that is, the Lutheran opinion—"as I was many years past in divers other errors, as transubstantiation." "Bucer," he says, "dissenteth not from Œcolampadius and Zwinglius." A catechism promulgated by King Edward, for all schoolmasters to use, is definitely anti-Lutheran. It is not strange, therefore, that the Articles of 1552 contained a formal repudiation of the doctrine of the local presence of Christ's body in the sacrament.

The movements of the Protestant reformers were too fast for the general sense of the nation. The opposition thus excited, and

the misgovernment under Northumberland, destroyed all
 Mary. hope of successful opposition to the accession of Mary.

He had persuaded Edward to thrust aside the order of succession to the throne, which had been fixed by Henry VIII. and Parliament, and to allot the crown to Lady Jane Grey, whom Northumberland had married to his son. Mary was narrow, possessed the obstinate will of her father, and was superstitiously attached to the faith of her mother. Her affinities in religion, as in race, were

Spanish. She proceeded as expeditiously as her more
 prudent advisers—of whom Charles V., and his son Philip
 of Spain, were the chief—would permit, to restore the

old system, and to undo the work of the two preceding reigns. Gardiner was released from prison, and took his place as chancellor in the queen's council. The deposed bishops were brought back to their sees. Latimer and Cranmer were sent to the Tower. The mass was restored, and the form of service which had been ordained by Henry VIII. was re-established by Parliament. Had the queen stopped here, the bulk of the nation might have supported her. But the proposition to give up the royal supremacy, and to bring England once more under the pope, was unwelcome. It involved an abandonment of Henry's system, which, notwithstanding the conversion of Gardiner and others from their adherence to it, was popular. For this reason there was opposition to the marriage of Mary to Philip, which she desired on personal grounds, and for the political reason that her throne needed protection against the pretensions of Mary Stuart, whom there was more reason to fear since her marriage with the heir of the French crown. The failure of the rebellion, of which the rising under Wyatt was a branch, and one object of which was the placing

The restoration of Catholicism.

of Lady Jane Grey on the throne, caused her execution, and the death, as traitors, of her husband, her father, and her uncle. The marriage of the queen with Philip followed. But Parliament refused to change the order of succession, which made Elizabeth the next heir to the crown, and refused to abrogate the Act of Supremacy, without a guarantee that the abbey lands should remain with their possessors. Reginald Pole, who was made legate of the Pope in 1554, and was to succeed Cranmer in the archbishopric, was the queen's spiritual counsellor. Now began the persecution which has caused the epithet "bloody" to be affixed to the name of Mary, as a popular designation, and which did more than all other measures together to plant in the English mind a hatred of "popery," and to send the roots of Protestantism deep into the soil. Not less than eight hundred Englishmen, whose lives were in danger, fled to Germany and Switzerland, to find an asylum among their Protestant brethren. Not far from three hundred, who remained at home, are known to have perished as victims of the persecution. The noble fortitude with which the bishops—Hooper, Latimer, Ridley—and numerous other martyrs, endured the fire, consecrated the cause for which they laid down their lives. It broke down the popularity of Mary, even with a multitude who were attached to the old religion, but felt a distaste for Spanish bigotry, and could appreciate the virtues of the sufferers. John Rogers, canon of St. Paul's—who had assisted Tynedale in translating the Scriptures—when he was led out to Smithfield, was received by the people, who were touched by his constancy, with cheers. He bathed his hands in the flame, "as if it was cold water." "Hooper limped cheerfully along with a stick"—he was lame from sciatica—"and smiled when he saw the stake." "Play the man, Master Ridley," said Latimer, as he stood in the flames; "we shall this day light up such a candle, by God's grace, in England, as I trust shall never be put out." The burning of Ridley and Latimer took place at Oxford, on a spot where Cranmer could see it from the prison-tower in which he was confined. From this time, his spirit, partly from physical exhaustion and partly from native timidity, appeared to give way altogether. On the accession of Mary he had refused to fly, and he had deported himself with firmness and dignity. But he was plied with arguments, entreaties, and with promises that were meant to delude him with a hope of saving his life, until he was prevailed on to affix his name to a series, six in number, of abject and humiliating recantations. Then he was led to St. Mary's Church, on his way to the stake; but there he disap-

Persecution of
Protestants.

pointed his enemies and judges by recalling the denials of his faith which had been extorted from his weakness and fear, and by professing anew the Protestant convictions for which he had contended. His penitence was as genuine as that of Peter, whom, if he did not equal in courage, he had resembled in a presumptuous confidence in his strength to endure temptation. His right hand, with which he had signed the denials of his faith, he held out in the flames until it was consumed. The lofty station of Cranmer, the associations that clustered about a prelate who had stood at the bedside of two kings of England, to impart to them the last consolations of religion, his kind and gentle ways in daily life, which, as even Pole testifies in the letter written to spread before him his alleged iniquities, had drawn to him the esteem of the people; his quiet and pathetic dignity in his last hours; the atrocious cruelty with which he was treated—a man now venerable in years—conspired to produce an impression of abhorrence for the authors of these inhuman proceedings. Yet it is necessary to remind the reader that Cranmer himself was no advocate of religious toleration. He had taken part in such acts as the condemnation of Frith, in 1533, for denying the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, the same doctrine as the Articles of 1552 likewise denied; he had participated in the execution of Jean Boucher, or Joan of Kent, who was called an Anabaptist, and was burned under Edward for an heretical opinion respecting the incarnation; and, in the last days of Edward, he and his associates were engaged in revising the canon law, and in shaping provisions for the punishment of believers in doctrines which he had not long before held himself, and for rejecting which he had afterwards condemned Frith and others to the flames. There was no taint of natural cruelty in his temper, but he had been completely under the sway of the idea that the will of the sovereign is the law for his people, as regards professions of faith and methods of worship, and that uniformity on these points is to be secured by pains and penalties.

The martyrdom of Cranmer has been called “the death-blow to Catholicism in England.” But other events helped to make the queen unpopular. Caraffa, the bigoted and resolute champion of the Catholic reaction, was elevated to the papacy, taking the name of Paul IV. He would be content with nothing short of the restoration of the abbey-lands to their old ecclesiastical owners, and the revival of monasticism in England. Mary was herself willing to comply with such impracticable demands, but she could not carry Parliament with her. Contrary to

Death of
Cranmer.

Catholic
divisions.

the wishes of the nation, and of her own chosen counsellors, she lent the help of England to Philip in his war with France, when Spanish victories could only tend to make the house of Austria supreme in Western Europe. English pride was mortified by the loss of Calais. In Ireland the restoration of the mass did not prevent warfare between the English settlers and the septs which they had displaced. There were troubles from the alliance of France with Scotland, where Protestantism was rather aided than hindered by the domination of Catholicism in England, and its union with Spain. Paul IV., with all his fanatical hostility to Protestantism, hated Spain, and had no liking for Pole, who had been in sympathy with the more moderate theology of Contarini and his school. The queen, whose whole soul was bound up with the cause of the Catholic Church, was forced to witness the antagonism of the pope to her husband, and to see the primate, her principal adviser in religious affairs, deprived of the legatine office. She died on November 17, 1558. The next night Cardinal Pole died.

The nation, which had before greeted Mary, now welcomed Elizabeth to the throne. She was twenty-five years of age, and at that time comely in person. Her life had been in peril at the accession of Mary; at the rebellion of Wyatt, of which she was supposed to have had some previous knowledge; and after the hope that an heir would be born to Mary was disappointed. She had been educated under the tuition of Roger Ascham, and was a good Greek and Italian scholar. She had conformed to the Catholic rites, but her inclinations to Protestantism were no secret. At the outset she made no precipitate changes; but soon she banished the mass from her chapel, and the restoration of the royal supremacy followed, although she relinquished the title of "Head of the Church," and chose to be called its "Governor." She notified Paul IV. of her election, but he haughtily replied that she was illegitimate, and must submit her claims, as against the pretensions of Mary Stuart, to his decision. Afterwards Pius IV. offered to make important concessions, such as the allowance of the cup to the laity and the use of the English liturgy; but his overtures came too late. In truth, Elizabeth's title to the crown was too closely connected with the validity of the divorce of Henry VIII. to permit her, had she been so disposed, to forsake the Protestant religion. She studied the Scriptures and read the fathers, especially Augustine. "If she chanced," says Lord Bacon, "even in common talk, to speak of God, she almost always both gave him the title of her Maker and composed her eyes and countenance to an expression

Character
of Elizabeth.

of humility and reverence, a thing which I have myself often observed." Yet, although she showed in remarkable emergencies that she had a sense of religion, this was less obvious in her ordinary life. She lacked womanly delicacy, was mendacious, profane, fond of flattery, and parsimonious to an extreme that put in jeopardy the most important undertakings. But she was fearless, full of energy, with the strong will of her father, and delighting in the splendor and show of royalty. She had the public virtue becoming the sovereign of a nation, chose the ablest advisers, of whom Cecil, Lord Burleigh, was chief, and controlled her own wishes—as in abstaining from a marriage with Leicester—when they clashed with the welfare of the kingdom. She was a Lutheran in her theology, and was not averse to ceremonies. On the altar of her own private chapel stood a crucifix and a burning candle. With her conservative tendencies, and her high ideas of regal authority, she had no sympathy with Calvinism, which was fast gaining ground in her own kingdom. Yet the political situation was such that she was not only compelled to render aid to Calvinists abroad, but to Calvinists in revolt against their sovereigns—the Huguenots in France, the Protestants in the Netherlands, and the followers of Knox in Scotland.

An interference of this sort was first called for in Scotland. There the spirit of feudalism had not been reduced, and the feeling of clanship was fervent. The aristocracy were extremely rough in their ways, except in the few instances where their manners were somewhat softened by intercourse with France. Under James V. the king and the clergy were united by a common desire to curb the turbulent nobility. There was nowhere a greater need of a religious reformation. The clergy were ignorant and profligate. They profited by the forfeitures and penalties inflicted on the aristocracy. The lay gentry saw what Henry VIII. had done in England, and looked with covetous eyes on the vast estates of their clerical rivals. The principal agent in carrying forward the government of James was Cardinal Beaton, a man of dissolute character, but of much ability, and a resolute upholder of the French interest. He proved himself competent to thwart the efforts of Henry to move his nephew to imitate him by breaking off connection with Rome. War with England ensued. The army of James was defeated in 1542 by the English at Solway Moss, and he died soon after. He left the kingdom in the midst of disorder from contending factions, with an infant daughter, Mary Stuart—the niece, on the mother's side, of the Duke of

Guise—as the heir of the crown. The Earl of Arran, in spite of the efforts of Beaton to take the supreme power into his hands, was made regent. Here and there an earnest religious Protestantism manifested itself. As early as 1528, Patrick Hamilton, who had been a student at Marburg, was put to death as a heretic. Of him it has been said that the smoke of his heresy “had infected all on whom it blew.” In 1543, George Wishart, who had been a student at Cambridge, and a schoolmaster, and had preached the evangelical doctrine in various parts of Scotland, was burnt at St. Andrew’s, by order of Beaton, who from a window was a spectator of his anguish, and of the courage with which he bore it. We first hear of John Knox, the leader in the Scottish Reformation, as a companion of Wishart, for the defence of whom, when he preached, Knox bore a two-handed sword. It was from the preaching of Wishart that he received his deep religious impressions. Little is known of his parentage, which was obscure. He studied at Glasgow, where he had among his teachers John Mair, a doctor of the Sorbonne, who had brought home with him from France the Gallican theory of church government, with democratic ideas as to the origin of kingly power and the virtue of tyrannicide. What, if any, influence, however, he exerted on the thoughts of his pupil respecting these matters, is not known. Knox was probably ordained as a priest when he was about twenty-five years old. After Wishart’s death he became a private tutor of boys. Beaton was assassinated, in 1546, by conspirators moved by hatred of his cruelty and resentment for private injuries, or by political animosity. Knox had no part in this deed of blood, but had no sorrow to express for it. The enemies of Beaton took refuge in the castle of St. Andrew’s. After some time Knox joined them, with the pupils he was then instructing. There he was called to preach, and reluctantly complied with the almost imperative summons of his brethren. The castle was taken by the French, he was carried to France as a captive, and was compelled to row in the galleys. After his release, in 1549, he was cordially received by Cranmer, preached in the North of England, but was not well enough satisfied with the ecclesiastical system of Edward to accept a bishopric that was offered to him. During the reign of Mary he was an exile, first at Frankfort, where he was the leader of the party who were opposed to the use of the English Prayer Book. The most of this period he spent at Geneva, in the society of Calvin and of the other preachers associated with him. There he published his “First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women,”

John Knox,
1505–1572.

which denied the right of women to rule nations, and was especially aimed at "the bloody Jezebel," as he afterward called her, who then reigned in England. Mary of Guise, the widow of James V., who was now regent, was secretly bent on subjecting Scotland to France; but her hostility to Mary of England and to Philip caused her to make the country an asylum even for her Protestant enemies. Knox returned in 1555, and preached with great effect in different parts of the country. He won to his side not only large numbers of the humbler class, but also many of the nobility and of the gentry. He thundered in the pulpit against idolatry, and the people responded by breaking in pieces the images of the saints and pulling down the monasteries. He denounced the mass as the worship of a false god. He was soon obliged to leave the country again, and accepted a call to Geneva. But the work had gained such an impetus that, under his inspiring influence, even from a distance, it went forward. Lord James Stuart, bastard son of the late king, was one of the principal nobles who joined in it. In 1557 the

The first
covenant.

"lords of the congregation" united in the first solemn covenant, whereby they renounced "the congregation of Satan, with all the superstitious abomination and idolatry thereof," and engaged to defend "the whole congregation of Christ, and every member thereof." Knox returned to Scotland in 1559. In the northern kingdom there was a combination of subjects against the established authority represented by the regent. Yet circumstances obliged Elizabeth to come to the help of the insurgents, and to strike a blow in behalf of Calvinism and rebellion, both of which she regarded with loathing. In the conflict with the Protestants

Triumph of
Protestant-
ism in Scot-
land.

the Scottish regent called in the aid of French troops. In 1558, Mary Stuart had married Francis II., and by a secret agreement had given away her kingdom, in the event of her death without heirs, to France. Francis and Mary styled themselves king and queen of England. Philip of Spain expected that in a war with France, Elizabeth would soon need his help, and that England would thus fall under his power. But the high-spirited English queen believed that the safest course was to brave all the dangers. She sent her troops into Scotland. She was successful, and, in 1560, in the Treaty of Edinburgh it was agreed that the French should withdraw, and that the government of Scotland should be committed to a Council of the Lords. The regent died in June of the same year. The Estates convened in August. By acts of the Scottish Parliament Calvinistic Protestantism was then made the established religion of Scotland.

Francis II., the young husband of Mary, died on December 6, 1560. Catharine de Medici now acquired power, and set about the task of mediating between the rival parties in France, and of keeping down the ambition of the Guises. Mary returned to her own kingdom to take her seat on her throne. She was beautiful in person, quick-witted, fascinating in her address, and with a boundless fund of energy. Her purpose from the first was to restore the old religion in Scotland ; but to attempt to do so at once would have exposed her to certain defeat, and it would have defeated another design that she never ceased to cherish—that of securing for herself the crown of England. She left the principal direction of affairs in the hands of her half-brother, whom she made Earl of Murray. To celebrate mass in her own chapel was a privilege which she gained with great difficulty, since it encountered the stern public condemnation of Knox, who denounced in the pulpit of St. Giles all such idolatry. He divined from the beginning the inmost purposes of the queen, and the powers of enchantment which she exerted effectually on almost all who approached her were lost on the discerning and intrepid preacher. His “History of the Reformation of Religion in Scotland” presents graphic narratives of the interviews which he had with her, and of the progress of the conflict in which he was her principal antagonist. She was careful to do nothing to give a legal sanction to the acts which had established the Protestant religion. After the civil war broke out in France, the hopes of Mary rose with every advantage gained by her uncles and the extreme Catholic faction, of which they were leaders. A victory of Guise would mean, as she believed, the downfall of Calvinism in Scotland, and then would follow a Catholic rising in England and the ruin of Elizabeth. But the hopes of Mary in this direction were wrecked by the conclusion of peace between Elizabeth and Catharine de Medici, in 1564. Then she abandoned the hope of a marriage with Don Carlos, or some other powerful prince on the continent, and, partly from an impulse of love, and partly from policy, as a means of bringing to her support the great earls in the north of England, and the English Catholics generally, she gave her hand to her cousin Darnley. He was the grandson of Margaret, the sister of Henry VIII., who, after the death of James IV., had married the Earl of Angus. The marriage with Darnley was a menace alike to Protestantism in Scotland and in England, and to the throne and life of Elizabeth. At this moment there was a dread, which proved to be mistaken, of a combi-

Mary in
Scotland.

Her conflict
with Knox.

Her marriage
with Darnley.

nation of France and Spain to crush heresy everywhere. The worthless character of Darnley was the means of averting great peril to the Protestant religion in Great Britain. His insolence enraged the nobles ; his drunkenness and other low vices disgusted his wife. Rizzio, an Italian favorite, had promoted the marriage. His murder was the result of a conspiracy, in which Darnley and some of the Protestant lords, to whom Rizzio was obnoxious, were the partners. Even then the apparent moderation of Mary in her

religious policy, in connection with the birth of her child,

1566. afterwards James I. of England, gave a brighter color to her prospects of succeeding, if not of supplanting, Elizabeth ; but the infatuation which led her to place herself under the influence of Bothwell was fatal to her expectations. Whether she was privy

Her relations to the murder of her husband or not, she married Both-
with Bothwell. well, by whom the deed was planned. At Carberry Hill

a battle was avoided between the forces of Bothwell and the army collected by the Scottish lords to destroy him, by the surrender

Her abdication, 1567. of Mary, who was taken as a prisoner to Lochleven.

There she abdicated the throne, appointing Murray regent during the minority of her son. Her escape from Lochleven was followed by the defeat of her army at Langside, and her precipitate flight into England, where she threw herself on the protection of Elizabeth.

After the coronation of James, the Parliament of Scotland confirmed the acts of 1560 for the establishment of Protestantism.

1567. This result was secured mainly through the steadfast spirit of Knox, who was not less resolute in withstanding the greed and ambition of the nobles, and their too great readiness for compromise, than in resisting the blandishments and threats of the queen.

In the constitution and government of the Scottish Church the lay eldership had a prominent place. In 1578 the "Second Book

Constitution of the Scottish Church.

of Discipline" embodied the full Presbyterian organization, ascending from the parish sessions through the presbyteries and provincial synods up to the General Assembly, which was supreme. Superintendents were retained, whose function it was to carry out the measures of the Assembly. At Frankfort, Knox had composed a book of devotion for public worship, which he used in his church at Geneva : "The Forme of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments, etc., used in the English Congregation at Geneva, and approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin." This, with a few changes, be-

came the "Book of Common Order" for the Scottish Church. It contains no form of absolution. It includes a confession of faith, which differs from that which Parliament and the General Assembly adopted. This new confession is derived from Calvin's catechism relating to the Apostles' Creed. The doctrine of the sacrament is identical with that of Calvin, as distinguished from the Lutheran and the earlier Zwinglian theory. There was a general form of expulsion of unworthy persons from the Lord's table, in connection with the ministration of the sacrament. This was called excommunication or "fencing of the tables." Marriages, as well as baptisms, were celebrated in church on Sundays. This "Book of Common Order" continued in use for about a hundred years, when it was dropped, in connection with the contest against the English Prayer Book. After the Presbyterian system had been established by the Assembly, the old polity of the Church remained as a matter of law. There were bishops, and also abbots and priors; these places being filled, after 1560, by Protestants and sometimes by laymen. In 1572 it was agreed between the ecclesiastical and civil authorities that the old names and titles of archbishops and bishops should continue, although the incumbents were to have no power greater than that of superintendents, and were subject to the kirk and General Assembly in spiritual things, as they were to the king in things temporal. The temporalities of the sees had mostly flowed into the hands of laymen. This was what Knox condemned: the revival of episcopacy, in the shadowy form just described, appears to have excited in him little or no opposition. After about twenty years the Presbyterian system, pure and simple, was established, under the auspices of Andrew Melville. Subsequently the attempts of James VI., to establish the royal supremacy, and to introduce the Anglican polity, began that contest between the throne and the kirk which signalized the following reign.

The changes in England in matters of religion were made by Elizabeth cautiously, and as circumstances prompted. The Protestants, if they were able and energetic, and strong in the large towns, still composed only a minority of her subjects. The clergy in convocation protested against changes in religion, and affirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation and the supremacy of the successors of St. Peter. The oath of submission to her supremacy was, at the first, not exacted with any strictness of the parish ministers. She ventured to restore the Prayer Book, and to enforce its use through an Act of Uniformity; but in the revision of

Religious
policy of
Elizabeth.

it the changes were obviously designed, by the removal of offensive passages, to conciliate the Roman Catholics. It was not until Mary Stuart had begun her plots in Scotland, and the Guises were gaining power in France, that the oath of supremacy was rigidly exacted of all clergymen. It was likewise imposed on civil officers of every grade. At the same time (in 1562), convocation revised the Articles—which were reduced from Forty-two to Thirty-nine—and the clergy were required to subscribe to them. These last measures are a landmark in the warfare of Elizabeth with the papacy.

We have now to consider the use made of the powers possessed by the queen through the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity, and through the Court of High Commission, which was clothed with ample powers for carrying these laws into effect. Apart from better motives and considerations of policy, her own religious indifference prevented her from caring to pry into the opinions of her subjects, or from inflicting penalties for mere belief. What is called religious persecution, in her reign, was almost exclusively indirect. What was demanded was compliance with the laws relative to outward worship, and the renunciation of allegiance to all foreign ecclesiastical authority. The government of Elizabeth took the ground which was taken by all Lutheran Protestants, and was expressed in Germany by the maxim, *cujus regio ejus religio*: the religion of a country is to be that of the sovereign. Only the Calvinists, who denied to the magistrate so extensive prerogatives, rejected this doctrine. Even they, when they could control the action of the state, as in Scotland or at Geneva, enforced uniformity. It is to be remembered, moreover, that the control of the civil authority in affairs of religion was the object which had been contended for in the long battle of the middle ages with the papacy, and against the usurpations of the clergy. To the foregoing remarks it should be added that whatever injustice and other evils grew out of the despotism of Henry VIII., and the despotism, not a little mitigated, of Elizabeth, it was only through a strong government in England, during this age of discord, that the land was saved from the unspeakable calamities of a civil war, in which, as in France, the hatred natural to such a contest would have been rendered doubly intense by religious animosity.

The severe measures against Roman Catholics in this reign were due, not to any antagonism to their theology, but to the political hostility which was often inseparably associated with it,

and to the magnitude of the consequent dangers to which the crown and the kingdom were exposed. The Protestantism of the queen was made the ground of attack upon her by foreign powers, and of plots against her life. In 1560 victory over the Huguenots in France was followed by a Catholic rebellion in the North of England. The demand was that Mary's title to the succession should be acknowledged. In 1570, Pius V. promulgated his bull, excommunicating the queen, deposing her and releasing her subjects from their allegiance. The pope encouraged the English Catholics in the North to revolt. Philip of Spain was deterred only by prudential motives from sending forces to aid them. The current of events was gradually leading to a direct conflict with Spain. For her own security she secretly provided assistance for the revolted subjects of Philip in the Netherlands, which pleased France, as her aid to the Scottish rebels had gratified Philip. Covertly she lent assistance, also, to the Huguenots. At length, the desperate condition of the Protestants in the Netherlands obliged her to send over troops openly for their succor. Shortly after, Drake appeared before St. Domingo and seized that island. As England drifted into a war with Spain, perils thickened at home. In 1568 Dr. Allen had established a Catholic college at Douay, for the education of priests for service in England. At the instigation of Gregory XIII., in 1576, they began their work. They were naturally considered by Elizabeth and her counsellors as fomenters of treason. Lord Bacon describes them as "seminary priests, who were bred in foreign parts, and supported by the purses and charities of foreign princes, professed enemies of this kingdom, and whose time had been passed in places where the very name of Elizabeth was never heard except as that of a heretic excommunicated and accursed;" . . . and who "had by their own arts and poisons depraved and soured with a new leaven of malignity the whole lump of Catholics, which had before been more meek and harmless." At length the priests were forbidden, on pain of death, to land, and it was made treason to harbor them. A considerable number of them were seized and executed. Burleigh explained to the world how the queen had been driven to depart from the merciful and tolerant policy toward the Roman Catholics with which she had begun her reign. But the defences of this change in her course do not avail as an excuse for the enforcement of the repressive laws against the priests at a later day, when the danger of Spanish invasion was over. Mary Stuart was the centre

Treatment of
Roman
Catholics.

England and
Spain.

1584

Mary Stuart.

of the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England, and of Elizabeth. By her advisers Mary's life was deemed a perpetual menace. When her complicity in the conspiracy of Babington, which involved a Spanish invasion, and the dethronement and death of

the queen, was proved, her death-warrant was signed,

and she was beheaded at Fotheringay. The sailing of the Spanish armada for the conquest of England was the culmination of a prolonged, desultory warfare, mainly on the ocean. It was the supreme effort of the Catholic reaction to annihilate the

Protestant strength. The destruction of this mighty

fleet by the valor of English seamen, reinforced by the tempest, was a mortal blow to the hopes of the enemies of Protestant England.

In order to understand the Puritan controversy we must look more closely at the general character of the Anglican Church, as

it was determined after the accession of Elizabeth. That controversy did not arise on account of any differences in theological doctrine. It must not be forgotten that the great question on which Protestants were divided was the Lord's Supper.

The adoption by the English reformers of the Swiss doctrine, in the form in which it was held by Bullinger and Calvin, established complete concord between the

The doctrine
of the Lord's
Supper.

two classes of theologians, and this amity was manifested and kept up by constant correspondence. Of Cranmer's conversion to the Swiss doctrine, and of its insertion in the Forty-two Articles, we have already spoken. In 1562, at the revision of the Articles, the pointed and emphatic condemnation of the Lutheran view was omitted, and the denial of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ was withdrawn; but the statement in the revised Articles (XXVIII. and XXIX.) is in exact conformity with the Calvinistic opinion. Bishop Jewel wrote to Peter Martyr: "As for matters of doctrine, we have pared everything away to the quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's-breadth; for as to the ubiquitarian theory"—the Lutheran view—"there is no danger in this country. Opinions of that kind can only gain admittance where the stones have sense." The explanation of the doctrine which is given in the homilies, sent forth to be read in the churches, is in perfect consonance with Calvin's teaching. "The real presence of Christ's body and blood," wrote Hooker, "is not in the sacrament but in the worthy receiver." The rubric at the close of the communion service, inserted in the Prayer Book of 1552, dropped in the Prayer Book of Elizabeth, but restored in 1661, affirms that "the

natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here ; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." At the same time the rubric, as amended in 1661, guards against the inference that a "real and essential" presence of Christ is denied.

Nor was there any conflict with the Protestant churches on the Continent on the subject of predestination. For a long period, the

The doctrine
of predestina-
tion.

Protestants held in common the essential points of the Augustinian tenet. The English reformers, Cranmer and Ridley included, professed the doctrine of unconditional election. Cranmer—not to speak of other proofs—indicates his opinion in the notes on the Great Bible. That is, they held to what was the main feature of both the Augustinian and Calvinistic systems. This doctrine is explicitly set forth in the Seventeenth

Influence of
Calvin.

Article. Through the whole reign of Edward, Calvin's personal influence was great in England. It grew to be still greater after the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. "His Institutes," says Blunt, a defender of High Church opinions and an opponent of Calvinism, "were generally in the hands of the clergy, and might be considered their text-book in theology." "The Institutes," says Hardwick, "became a sort of oracle and text-book for the students in the universities." Hooker, writing near the end of Elizabeth's reign, speaks of Calvin's authority as having equalled that of the "Master of Sentences," Peter Lombard, in the flourishing period of scholasticism, "so that the perfectest divines were judged they who were skilfulest in Calvin's writings." Hooker himself praises the Institutes and the commentaries of Calvin, and has no contest with his doctrinal system. He pronounces him "incomparably the wisest man that ever the French Church did enjoy, since the hour it enjoyed him." Bullinger's writings were held, likewise, in the highest esteem ; so that as late as 1586, young curates not licensed to preach were directed by the Southern Convocation to provide themselves with a Bible and Bullinger's Decades in Latin or English. There were shades of difference in England, as in the Reformed churches abroad, on this subject of predestination. There were higher and more moderate Calvinists.

The "Lambeth Articles."

This was manifest in connection with the "Lambeth Articles," in which predestination was set forth in a bald and rigid form. In them assurance is declared essential to saving faith. They grew out of attacks on predestination by certain individuals in the university of Cambridge. They were subscribed by Whitgift, then Archbishop of Canterbury ; by Hutton,

Archbishop of York, and by the Bishops of London and of Bangor. The amendment of these Articles by Hutton, and still more the expressions of Hooker on the subject of which they treat, indicate a rising disposition to avoid the more extreme type of predestinarian theology. Yet this disposition was in accord with the views of Bullinger. It was the manifestation, for the first time, of dissent from Calvinism, that called out the Lambeth declaration, and Fuller is not far out of the way in saying that it expressed "the general and received doctrine of England in that age."

At the outset, and for a long period, there was no controversy among the reformers on the subject of episcopacy. The Church govern- Lutherans, in the Smalcaldic Articles, declare episcopacy
ment. to be a human institution, and assert that when ordinary bishops become enemies of the Church or refuse to ordain, they may be dispensed with. Melancthon wanted bishops, as a means of protecting the Church from disorder and from the apprehended tyranny of princes, and Luther would not have objected to them. Bishops were retained by the Lutherans in Sweden, and, in the form of superintendents, in Denmark. Calvin recommended the King of Poland to retain bishops, and felt no repugnance to the exercise of a presidency by a single minister, who should be appointed to such a duty by the Church. When Swiss divines came to England they generally found many things which they wished to see reformed; but to bishops, as such, they had no repugnance. When English divines went to Strasburg, Zurich, or Geneva, they felt not the slightest scruples on the score of the parity of the clergy which they found to be established in these places.

Until we approach the close of Elizabeth's reign there are no traces, in the Anglican Church, of the *jure divino* idea of episcopacy—the doctrine that bishops are necessary to the be- Views of
episcopacy. ing of a church, and that without episcopal ordination the functions of the ministry cannot be lawfully discharged. The Articles are obviously drawn up according to the prevalent idea that each national church is to determine its own polity and ceremonies. Episcopacy is not among the notes of the Church, as it is defined in them. "Orders" are not allowed to be called sacraments in the scriptural sense, since for these there is requisite some "visible sign or ceremony ordained of God." It had been the common view in the middle ages that the difference between bishop and priest is one of *office* and not of *order*, the defining characteristic of "order" being power to perform a special act, involving a certain indelible character impressed on the soul. The

priest, as capable of performing the miracle of the Eucharist, was in everything, except in office or function, on a level with the bishop. This opinion was held even by Bellarmine. It prevailed among the Anglican reformers. It is taught in "The Institution of a Christian Man," published by authority in 1537. It is asserted by Bishop

Jewel's doctrine as to orders.

Jewel in his "Apology" for the Church of England, and in his "Defence" of the "Apology." The first of

these works, translated into English by the wife of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Elizabeth ordered to be chained in every parish church in England, that it might be freely read and consulted. The Preface to the Ordinal in the Prayer Book, to be sure, affirms that "from the apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church : bishops, priests, and deacons." Yet the term "orders" is used by Jewel, for example, in a popular sense, as interchangeable with "degrees," and it is rendered "degrees" in the translation of his "Defence." This view, it may be remarked, that the distinction of bishop and presbyter is one of office, and not of order, cannot be considered a mere legacy from the schoolmen, received without scrutiny. It is held much later by so learned and celebrated defenders of episcopacy as Dean Field

Cranmer's views.

and Archbishop Ussher. A catechism, approved by Cranmer in 1548, and said to have been mainly a translation

of a Lutheran work, teaches a succession from the apostles of "bishops and priests" in the ministry ; but nothing is said of the relation of the two classes of ministers to one another. "It was not," says Blunt, "until the close of the sixteenth century that the distinction between the orders of bishops and priests was asserted." At the end of Edward's reign, Cranmer was writing to Melancthon, Bullinger, and Calvin, in the hope of procuring a general synod of the Protestant churches for the construction of a common basis of doctrine. In these letters there is no hint of any important matter to be considered as a ground of fellowship save the grand mooted point of the Lord's Supper. The statute of the 13th of Elizabeth made room for ministers ordained abroad, according to other forms than those prescribed in the Prayer Book, to be admitted to parishes in England. Such ministers, as is shown by numerous incontrovertible proofs, were thus admitted in considerable numbers, through Elizabeth's reign, and even far into the next century. Down to the era of Laud and Charles I., when the sacerdotal theory of episcopacy had taken root, the validity of the ordination received by the ministry of foreign churches was not seriously impugned, nor was there an interruption of ecclesiastical

fellowship between them and the Church of England. Even in the great reaction after the restoration of the Stuarts, the Act of Uniformity, in 1661, which required episcopal ordination of all incumbents of benefices, added the proviso "that the penalties in this act shall not extend to the foreigners or aliens of the foreign Reformed churches allowed, or to be allowed, by the king's majesty, his heirs and successors in England."

There were two stages in the Puritan controversy. In the first, the subject of contention was the use of the vestments of the clergy and of certain ceremonies. In the second, into which

The ritualistic controversy.

the first led, prelacy and the relation of Church to State were the great matters in debate. From the beginning there were some in England who wished to introduce more radical changes than the government—not to speak now of the temper of the people—would allow. Their general aim was to conform the Reformation in England to the type which it had assumed in the Reformed or Calvinistic churches on the continent. This tendency was strengthened by the presence of the eminent foreign divines whom Cranmer drew about him in the reign of Edward. It acquired a fresh and powerful stimulus by the return of the exiles—eight hundred in number—who had been inhospitably regarded by the Lutherans, and who had resorted mostly to Zurich and Geneva, or to the cities of the Rhine, where Calvinism was established. The vacant bishoprics, of which after Elizabeth's accession there were thirteen, were naturally filled with the staunch defenders of Protestantism, who had preferred exile to submission to the papal system as restored by her predecessor. Parker, who had remained in England, in some place of safe seclusion, was made Archbishop of Canterbury. The new leaders among the clergy desired to cast aside the cap and surplice, and with them other peculiarities of the ritual which had been generally dropped by their Protestant brethren on the continent. The ground of the objection

Objection to the vestments, etc.

to these things was that they were identified in the popular mind with the notion that the minister is a priest. They were often pronounced to be badges of "popery." When it was said in reply that the usages in question were indifferent in their nature, not being forbidden in the gospel, it was rejoined that they are misleading, and that, even if not contrary to a commandment of Scripture, the civil magistrate still has no right to compel the observance of them. In this last proposition was evidently involved an idea as to the royal supremacy, which might eventually lead to a grave conflict. When it is remembered what a ferment

has been excited in England recently by ritualistic controversies, which, considering the present time in comparison with the past, are of far less moment, there need be no surprise at the out-breaking of the Puritan debate, which related to themes lying in the same province. In the framing of the Prayer Book care had been taken to offend as little as possible the adherents of the Catholic system, and the people who had an inbred attachment to the

Attitude of
the conserva-
tives.

methods of worship under which they had grown up. In the Prayer Book the conservatives found a warrant for their proclivities in religious thought. Of the mass of the parish priests but very few were deprived of their livings when Elizabeth came in. What would be the effect upon the more than nine thousand beneficed clergymen who had so lately used their missals and breviaries, if innovations of a radical character in the accustomed forms should be suddenly introduced and imposed by law? Besides the consideration of safety and expediency, there was rising among the clergy a school of Protestant divines who were more and more disposed to go back of Calvin to Augustine, and to draw their theological and ecclesiastical principles from the Church of the first three centuries. Yet the party averse to the continued use of the vestments was strong in numbers, and still more influential from the ability and standing of its members. In

Hooper.

the reign of Edward, Hooper, when chosen, in 1550, to the bishopric of Gloucester, at first refused to wear the bishop's apparel at his consecration. After he had been imprisoned the difficulty was settled by a compromise. In 1555 the

Troubles at
Frankfort.

trouble sprung up among the English exiles at Frankfort, where Knox was one of the leaders of a party which demanded changes in the communion service of the Prayer Book, and other alterations in connection with them. When this party was outnumbered by fresh emigrants from England who attached themselves to the other side, he withdrew to Geneva. At the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, there was a general feeling among her newly-appointed bishops in favor of the disuse of the vestments and of the other offensive ceremonies, such as kneeling at the sacrament, signing the cross in baptism, etc. This was the wish of Jewel, who stigmatized the clerical garb as "a relic of the Amorites," and in his letters to Peter Martyr rejoiced that in Scotland the "theatrical dresses," etc., had been consigned to the flames. With him agreed Nowell, Sandys, afterwards Archbishop of York, Grindal, who followed Parker as Archbishop of Canterbury, and many other divines. Even Parker, at the outset, appears to have

looked on the vestments with disfavor. Burleigh, Walsingham, Leicester, and many other prominent civilians, were of the same

mind. But this was a matter on which the queen was inflexible. The Swiss divines who were consulted by Jewel and his associates, generally advised a humoring of her wishes, rather than a refusal to take office at the risk of driving Elizabeth nearer the papal party. Many of the clergy, however, did not conform to the obnoxious parts of the ritual. A sort of chaos ensued in the modes of worship. Elizabeth determined to put an end to this confusion and to this disobedience to her enactments. It was Elizabeth, and not her bishops, who compelled the use of the vestments. Parker was required to prosecute the delinquents. At length the Puritans began to organize in separate "conventicles," as their meetings were styled by their adversaries, in order to worship in the manner which they approved. They were numerous. Their clergy were learned and effective preachers, and both clergy and people were willing to suffer for the sake of conscience. Whatever diversity of opinion may exist at the present day in respect to the merits of the ritual controversy, there can be no want of approval of the zeal of the Puritans against pluralities and in favor of a stricter discipline in the Church, and of an educated, earnest ministry to take the place of the thousands of unworthy and grossly ignorant clergymen.

If Hooper was the father of Puritanism in its incipient form, a like relation to Puritanism, as a ripe and developed system, belongs to

Thomas Cartwright, Lady Margaret's professor of divinity at Cambridge. Yet, Puritanism, by being associated, under his auspices, with Presbyterianism, and with the Presbyter-

rian system as an exclusively authorized system of polity, cooled the zeal of no small number of those who might before have been counted among its adherents. The first

point in Cartwright's system is that the Scriptures are not only the rule of faith, but also the rule of the government and discipline of the Church. They prescribe, as he holds, a system of polity from which the Church is not at liberty to depart. The second point is that the management of church affairs belongs to the Church itself and its officers, and not to civil magistrates. Thus Calvinism asserted in England its doctrine of the independence of the Church of State control, and also its doctrine of the control of the State by the Church; for Cartwright was no friend of toleration. In his view there must be uniformity in religion, enforced by the civil authority. Moreover, he maintained that the system of polity

Position of
the queen.

Cartwright,
1535-1603.

His theory
of Presbyte-
rianism.

which the Scriptures ordain is the Presbyterian, and that prelacy is, therefore, unlawful.

Against these views there rose in opposition the queen herself, who was disposed to push her undefined visitatorial power even so far as to prohibit the meetings of clergymen for mutual improvement, and, with her, all supporters of the royal supremacy when it was kept within narrower limits.

Opposition to
Cartwright's
doctrines.

Against Cartwright's views there were arrayed, moreover, all defenders of the Episcopal system of church government. These, including Whitgift, Archbishop of Canterbury, the principal opponent of Cartwright's doctrines, even then were far from asserting the *jure divino* theory, or the necessity of bishops, in the sense that a church cannot exist without them. They went no farther than to maintain the antiquity and expediency of the Episcopal organization. "Wherein," says Whitgift, "do we agree with the papists? or wherein do we dissent from the reformed churches? With these we have all points of doctrine and substance in common; from the others we dissent in the most part both of doctrine and ceremonies." But one extreme tended to beget another. Bancroft, who

Jure divino
Episcopacy.

eventually became the successor of Whitgift, is thought to have been the first to propound the exclusive theory, which would cast the other Protestant churches out of the Church Catholic; but it is doubtful whether his sermon at St. Paul's Cross, in 1589, warrants the imputation. At the consecration, in 1610, of the Scottish bishops, who had received only Presbyterian ordination, he met a "scruple," or inquiry, of Bishop Andrewes, with the remark that ordination by presbyters, where bishops could not be had, was sufficient. The bishops then created were sent to preside over Presbyterian clergy.

About the end of the sixteenth century a new turn was given to the Puritan controversy by the publication of the work of Hooker, the treatise on "Ecclesiastical Polity." His serene, dispassionate spirit, his vigor and eloquence, seemed to take up the controversy into a higher atmosphere. He believes in the apostolic institution of Episcopacy, and admits his difference from Jewel, his revered master and guide, in holding that bishops are a distinct order from presbyters. But he enters into a discussion of the nature of laws and the origin of authority. While claiming that Episcopacy is the primitive form of government, and the best form, he affirms that "the whole church visible being the true original subject of all power," "it may be in some cases not unnecessary that we decline from the ordinary ways," when led

Richard
Hooker, 1553-
1600; His
principles.

thereto by "an exigence of necessity." Although Episcopacy be of divine ordination, there is no necessity, he tells us, "for an everlasting continuance of bishops." Episcopacy is not necessary, he teaches, for the validity of the sacraments. "There may be," he

concedes, "a very great and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop." Calvin, he thinks, did the best he could in his church arrangements at

Geneva. Thus Hooker made space for the full ecclesiastical recognition of the foreign Protestant churches, and for "the numbers," to quote the words of Keble, "who had been admitted to the ministry of the Church in England, with no better than Presbyterian

ordination." Through the century that followed the Reformation there was in general a fraternal recognition of the foreign Protestant churches. It may be sufficient

to refer to the names of three prominent churchmen, all of them eminent defenders of Episcopacy as the earliest and best

method of church government. The first is Richard Field, 1561-1616. Field, Dean of Gloucester, who in his famous work on the Church, defends the foreign churches and the sufficiency of their

orders. The second is Bishop Joseph Hall, who wrote much later, and at the request of Laud, but who repudiates with warmth the charge of uncharitableness in relation to the foreign Protestant churches, which, he says, for want of Episcopacy "lose nothing of the true essence of a church." Hall was one of the deputies who sat in the Synod of Dort. The third name is that

of Ussher, the most learned champion of Episcopacy in that age, who maintains the same view. Long after the Restoration and the great Episcopal reaction that attended it, even until now, like principles have been maintained by

many divines of high distinction in the English Church. Archbishop Wake in 1724 wrote to Courayer: "I should

be sorry to affirm that, where the government is not Episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the sacraments;" and, in 1719, he wrote to Le Clerc, concerning the

Continental Protestant churches: "Far be it from me to have such an iron heart, that on account of this defect"—the absence of Episcopal government—"I should think that any of them ought to be cut off from our communion; or, with some mad writers among us"—*furiosis inter nos scriptoribus*—"I should affirm that they have no true and valid sacraments, and even that they are hardly to be called Christians."

But from the time of Bancroft another school grew up, which

was disposed to make Episcopacy essential, not merely to the well-being, but also to the being of a church. This is the view presented in the writings, on this subject, of Jeremy Taylor. It is characteristic of the school of Hammond and of Laud. Its growth is partly to be ascribed to the feelings engendered by the Puritan assaults upon prelacy, and the assertion by Presbyterians of the exclusive right of their system; partly to an alienation, on doctrinal and other grounds, from the German Lutherans, and the spread of Arminianism in England, by which the bond of sympathy with the Calvinistic churches abroad was weakened; and partly to the decrease of danger from the side of the Roman Catholic party, which rendered the union of Protestants in England with one another and with their brethren abroad a less imperative necessity. But beyond these specific causes of the growth of High Church doctrine, we must not overlook an increasing influence, not springing wholly from these agencies, of what have been called "the primitive and Catholic elements," which, along with the Protestant elements, from the beginning entered into the Anglican system. There had been less disposition than existed elsewhere to isolate any single doctrine, or to give to it an exclusive prominence. Above all, there had been from the outset what may be termed a patristic spirit—a desire to follow, as far as might be, the teachings of the early Fathers, and the models of church organization in the first centuries. The habit of quoting the Fathers for the support and illustration of doctrines is exemplified in a striking way—to give but one instance—in the homilies appointed, under Elizabeth, to be read in the churches.

The Presbyterian principles of Cartwright, and the intolerant theories which he coupled with them, made it easier for Elizabeth to resist the increasing demand for changes in the ritual. Yet the progress of Puritanism in its essential spirit was steady during all the years of the mortal conflict of England with Spain, and down to the end of her reign. The influence of Calvinism was seen in the growing courage and independence of her parliaments. She saw when it was necessary to give way to their requirements, and on such occasions was prudent enough to yield. In the Church itself, Puritanism made an equal progress. "At the very outset of her reign," writes Mr. Green, "the need of replacing the Marian bishops by stanch Protestants, forced her to fill the English sees with men whose creed was, in almost every case, Calvinistic. The bulk of the lower clergy, indeed, were left without change; but as the older parsons died out their places

were mostly filled by Puritan successors. The universities furnished the new clergy, and, at the close of Elizabeth's reign, the tone of the universities was hotly Puritan. Even the outer uniformity on which the queen set her heart took a Puritan form. The use of the Prayer Book, indeed, was enforced; but the aspect of English churches, and of English worship, tended more and more to the model of Geneva. The need of more light to follow the service in the new Prayer Books served as a pretext for the removal of stained glass from the church windows. The communion table stood almost everywhere in the midst of the church. If the surplice was generally worn during the service, the preacher often mounted the pulpit in a Geneva gown. We see the progress of this change in the very chapel of the primates themselves. The chapel of Lambeth House was one of the most conspicuous among the ecclesiastical buildings of the time; it was a place 'whither many of the nobility, judges, clergy, and persons of all sorts, as well strangers as natives, resorted.' But all pomp of worship gradually passed away from it. Under Cranmer the stained glass was dashed away from its windows. In Elizabeth's time the communion table was moved into the middle of the chapel, and the credence table destroyed. Under James, Archbishop Abbot put the finishing stroke on all attempts at a high ceremonial. The cope was no longer used as a special vestment in the communion. The primate and his chaplains forbore to bow at the name of Christ. The organ and choir were alike abolished, and the service reduced to a simplicity which would have satisfied Calvin."

There were two classes of dissenters against whom the Act of Uniformity was enforced without mercy. The first was the Independents, of whose origin we shall speak hereafter. The other was the Baptists, who were unjustly confounded with the Anabaptist preachers of anarchy in Germany, and who furnished the only martyrs who in this reign were burnt at the stake.

A sketch of the Reformation in Great Britain would be incomplete without some notice of the attempts to plant Protestantism in Ireland. Ireland, one of the last of the countries to become fully subject to Holy See, has been equalled by none in its devotion to the Roman Church; although the independence of the country was wrested from it under the warrant of a bull of Adrian IV., which gave it to Henry II. Protestantism was associated with the hated domination of foreigners,

and was propagated according to methods recognized in that age as lawful to the conqueror. Invaders who were engaged in an almost perpetual conflict with a subject race, the course of which was marked by horrible massacres, could hardly hope to convert their enemies to their own religious faith. Henry VIII., having made himself the head of the English Church, proceeded to establish his religious supremacy in the neighboring island. This was ordained by the Irish Parliament in 1537, but was resisted by a great part of the clergy, with the Archbishop of Armagh at their head. George Browne, a willing agent of the king, who had been provincial of the Augustine friars in England, was made Archbishop of Dublin. The Protestant hierarchy was constituted, but the people remained Catholic. The mistaken policy of seeking to Anglicize the country was pursued, and the services of religion were conducted in a tongue which they did not understand. The Prayer Book, which was introduced in 1551, was not rendered into Irish, but was to be rendered into Latin, for the sake of ecclesiastics and others who were not acquainted with English! On the accession of Mary, the new fabric which had been raised by Henry VIII. and his son fell to pieces without resistance. As the Catholic reaction became organized in Europe, and began to wage its contest with Queen Elizabeth, the Irish, who had to some extent attended the English service, generally deserted it. Protestantism had no footing outside of the Pale, or where English soldiers were not present to protect it or force it upon the people.

The Irish
Episcopal
Church.

The Episcopal Church in Ireland wore a somewhat Puritanic cast, and in its formularies set forth prominently the Calvinistic theology. The Articles of Faith—which were superseded by the Thirty-nine Articles—were composed in 1615, probably by Archbishop Ussher, then Professor of Divinity in Dublin. They incorporate for substance the Lambeth Articles on predestination. The doctrine of the Lord's supper is set forth very distinctly, according to the Calvinistic conception. The Irish Articles were the chief source from which were drawn the creeds of the Westminster Assembly. The New Testament was not translated into Irish until 1602; and the Prayer Book, though translated earlier, was not sanctioned by public authority, and was little used. Among various wise suggestions in Lord Bacon's tract, written in 1601, entitled "Considerations touching the Queen's Service in Ireland," is a recommendation to take care "of the versions of Bibles and catechisms, and other books of instruction, into the Irish language." With equal sagacity and good feeling, he counsels

the establishment of colonies or plantations, the sending out of fervent, popular preachers, and of pious and learned bishops, and the fostering of education. He recommends mildness and toleration rather than the use of the temporal sword. But the policy which the great philosopher and statesman marked out was very imperfectly followed.

CHAPTER VII.

THE REFORMATION IN ITALY AND SPAIN: THE CATHOLIC COUNTER-REFORMATION.

PROTESTANTISM was not confined to Northern and Central Europe. It early extended across the Alps and the Pyrenees into Italy and Spain. But here forces were gradually organized which were to arrest the progress of its principles, and even to drive them out of lands in which they had apparently gained a firm foothold. It was natural that the cause of the Reformation should find adherents among the Italians. Upon their country the temporal ambition of the popes had brought untold evils. They were familiar, as nations more distant from Rome could not be, with corruptions in the papal government of the Church. The vices of the clergy, the arrogance and venality of the Roman court, had been exposed by their greatest writers, beginning with Dante. From the minds of cultivated Italians, through the influence of the new learning, superstition, and even moderate reverence for ecclesiastical authority, had well-nigh vanished. But while these circumstances were favorable to the introduction of Protestantism, there were other circumstances, equally important, which stood in the way of its final success. The Italians looked upon the papacy as a national institution. On this account they were jealous of all attempts from abroad to curtail its prerogatives. To multitudes of them it brought high position, wealth, and influence. The ancient spirit of liberty and patriotism had given place to the desire of personal aggrandizement. Even those whose minds had been emancipated from the sway of mediævalism by their humanistic studies were often either skeptical or indifferent, and far from being inclined to make sacrifices for the sake of their opinions. There were, moreover, here as in other countries, many who clung with unyielding tenacity to every part of the traditional system.

Italian judgments of the papacy.

The principles of Protestantism were first introduced into Italy through writings of Luther and of the other reformers, which, under fictitious names, were widely circulated, and were for a time read without suspicion even in the Vatican itself.

Character of
Protestantism
in Italy.

Many Italians, attracted by the fame of Melancthon, who was held in esteem by scholarly men everywhere, travelled to Wittenberg and there learned the new doctrines. Others heard them from the Lutheran soldiers who poured into Italy during the campaign of Charles V. against the pope. Protestantism was, nevertheless, not strong enough to avow itself without being instantly smothered. The little companies of those who were in full sympathy with its ideas could exist only as secret societies; for, although there was no central government to enforce throughout the peninsula measures of repression, and as yet no effective Inquisition, the different states were thoroughly under the influence of Catholic traditions and of the Roman see. Those who favored the movement for reform did not all have the same objects in view. Some sought merely to put an end to the abuses which hindered the proper administration of the Church. Others cherished the view of justification advocated by the reformers, but yet clung to the hierarchical organization as well as to the prevailing forms of worship. Protestantism in Italy was thus a thing of degrees, and in its earlier stages developed itself in conjunction with tendencies which eventually diverged into the reactionary, defensive, and aggressive force to which the Catholic Church owed its restoration.

Even before the death of Leo X., the skeptical and epicurean tone of society, which had been so prevalent in Italy from the beginning of the Renaissance, began to give way to a more earnest religious spirit. Fifty or sixty persons united in Rome in what they called the Oratory of Divine Love, and held meetings for worship and mutual edification. Among their number were Caraffa, Contarini, and Sadolet, who were subsequently made cardinals. Although such men as Caraffa and Contarini were drawn together by their common desire for the removal of ecclesiastical abuses and for the moral reformation of the Church in head and members, they were destined to stand far apart in their attitude towards Protestantism. Contarini was to advocate views of justification closely allied to those of the reformers, and to take the lead in the celebrated conference at Ratisbon; while Caraffa was to found anew the Inquisition, and, as Paul IV., to be the very embodiment of the Catholic reaction. A few years later there were associated with Contarini, at Venice, besides his

The Oratory
of Divine
Love.

former friends, several others who sympathized with his evangelical ideas. Among them were Flaminio the poet, Brucioli, the Florentine translator of the Scriptures, and Reginald Pole, the English ecclesiastic who had refused to countenance the revolutionary measures of Henry VIII. in relation to the Church. Their doctrine of justification, bringing with it a greater or less inclination to other doctrinal changes, spread among the intelligent classes throughout Italy. It was protected and fostered at the court of Renée, Duchess of Ferrara, which Calvin visited, and where Clement Marot, the French poet, found a refuge. It was taught for a while at the university of Bologna, and defended in the academy at Modena. Such was its currency in the latter place that the bishop, Cardinal Morone, who had been absent in Germany on missions from the pope, wrote in 1542, "Wherever I go, and from all quarters, I hear that the city has become Lutheran." In Venice, where the book trade flourished, and where the internal police was less severe, many embraced Protestantism. Here labored Pietro Carnesecchi, who afterward died for his faith. At Naples the evangelical doctrine found an earnest and influential supporter in Juan Valdez, the secretary of the viceroy of Charles V. Among the distinguished Italians who were in sympathy with it were Vittoria Colonna, and several other remarkable women; Bernardino Ochino, the greatest preacher of the day, whose venerable appearance and eloquent speech enchained the attention of the crowds who came to hear him; and Peter Martyr Vermigli, who, though not so powerful an orator as Ochino, was a much abler theologian. Hardly a prominent city in Italy but possessed a circle of cultivated people who cherished the new opinions. In Venice and Naples churches were organized with pastors, and meetings were held in secret. The books of the reformers were eagerly purchased. "Whole libraries," says Melancthon, in a letter written probably in 1540, "have been carried from the late fair into Italy." A little treatise on the "Benefits of Christ," which formerly was incorrectly ascribed to Aonio Palcario, was circulated in thousands of copies. So great had been the success of Protestantism thus far that Caraffa was led to say to Paul III., that "the whole of Italy was infected with the Lutheran heresy, which had been extensively embraced by both statesmen and ecclesiastics." But the forces of the counter-reformation and of the Catholic reaction were already at work.

Paul III., who succeeded Clement VII. in 1534, combined in his person and in his policy characteristics both of the papacy of the past

and of that of the future. He had been raised to the cardinalate by Alexander VI., and like him had children whom he sought to endow with wealth and high station. But, on the other hand, he was friendly to the Catholic reforming party. One of his first acts was to make Contarini cardinal, and at his suggestion to elevate to the same rank Caraffa, Pole, Sadoleto, and others of like character. He requested them to draw up a statement of such reforms as they deemed advisable. Their "consilium," or opinion, was approved by him, and commissions of reform were appointed whose business it was to remove the abuses in the papal curia. Not long after occurred the conference at Ratisbon, which was an attempt by the evangelical Catholics, under the leadership of Contarini, to restore by compromise the unity of the Church. The failure of the conference was due in no small measure to the influence of Caraffa, and of men of similar views, who, while they were anxious to infuse a spirit of strict, and even ascetic purity and zeal into the hierarchy, were inflexibly hostile to all changes in the dogmas and organization of the Church. It was this party who revived the tone of the Catholic Church, rallied its scattered forces, and turned upon its adversaries with a renewed and formidable energy. To accomplish their object they maintained the Inquisition in Spain and reorganized it in Italy, reared a bulwark of Romanism in the decrees of Trent, and created religious orders, especially the Society of Jesus.

As in previous ages of the Church, the revival of zeal was signalized by new developments of the monastic spirit. A fraternity called the Theatins was organized by Caraffa and his friend Thiene. Its principal aim was the reform of the clergy. The members were priests with monastic vows. They devoted themselves to preaching, administering the sacraments, and caring for the sick. But their importance, as well as that of other similar societies, was soon overshadowed by the more renowned and influential order of the Jesuits. The founder of the Society of Jesus was Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard of noble birth. In early manhood he had been severely wounded while fighting against the French at the siege of Pampeluna. During the illness which followed he began to dream of chivalrous adventures, not in the service of his king and his lady, but in that of Christ and the Virgin. He exchanged the romance of "Amadis" for the lives of the saints. The glory of Dominic and Francis charmed his imagination. Upon his recovery he hung up his shield and lance before an image of the Virgin, and then retired to a convent, there to

The moderate
and the strict
parties.

The Theatins.

Loyola,
1491-1556.

surrender himself to a life of ascetic severity. His soul was afflicted with torments which allowed him no peace until he cast them out as inspirations of the evil spirit. He turned his back upon asceticism, but retained that insatiable yearning for rapturous experiences which often accompanies it. At Paris, where in 1528 Ignatius went to study theology, he brought the minds of two companions, Faber and Francis Xavier, completely under the influence of his ideas. The little society which was formed in a cell of the College of St. Barbara was soon enlarged by the addition of seven new members. They took the monastic vows and pledged themselves to spend their lives, if possible, in Jerusalem, in the care of Christians or in efforts to convert the Saracens ; or, if this should not be permitted them, they promised to offer themselves to the pope to be employed in the service of the Church as he should direct. In Venice they were ordained priests, and here they learned that the most formidable adversaries against whom they were to contend were in Europe, and not in Palestine. Their order was sanctioned by Paul III. in 1540 ; in 1543, unconditionally. They chose Ignatius for their president. The labors to which the new order gave itself were principally preaching, hearing confessions, and directing individual consciences, and especially the education of the young. With the proper accomplishment of these duties no monastic austerities were allowed to interfere. The inward life of the members was moulded by the study of the "Spiritual Exercises" of Ignatius. This manual set forth a course of severe and prolonged introspection, and of forced, continuous attention to certain themes, taken, for the most part, from the Gospels ; the design of the whole being to detach the soul from every object of earthly desire, to excite and at the same time to enslave the imagination, and to bind the will immovably in the path of religious consecration. Four weeks was the time generally spent, at the outset, in this spiritual drill. The society, with its four classes of members—the novices, the scholastics, the coadjutors, and the professed—was so compactly organized that even the general, notwithstanding his almost unlimited power, was under as strict oversight as the humblest novice, and could, for adequate reasons, be deposed. Every member was bound to yield unquestioning obedience to his superior. He might be ordered to visit a tribe of savages in the remotest part of the globe, but he must depart instantly and without a murmur. It was this organization, guided by a single will and devoted to the service of the Roman see, which not only withstood the advance of Protestantism, but carried the Catholic doc-

The Society
of Jesus.

trines into new lands, and even reconquered territory which was well-nigh lost to the Church. In the capacity of teachers or confessors, they gained access to the courts of princes, and were able to exert much influence in political affairs. To the instruction of the young they devoted themselves with a just sense of the importance of this work. But the literary achievements of the Jesuits have been chiefly in the departments of antiquarian research or of exact science, and not in the directions where freedom of intellectual movement or the play of imagination are essential to success.

Strange as it may seem, a general council, so long the dread of the popes, was the second great agency in the restoration of the Church of Rome. After the failure of the Conference at Ratisbon, Paul III. acceded to the wishes of the emperor, and issued the summons for the Council of Trent.

The Council
of Trent,
1545-47,
1551-52,
1562-63.

It was the only way of preventing Charles from attempting himself to adjust the religious difficulties in Germany through a diet. The papal legates opened its sessions in December, 1545, and soon acquired so complete a control over the assembly that nothing was undertaken without the pope's sanction. It was determined that the members should vote as individuals, and not as nations—a point not gained without the distribution of money among poor bishops. The legates were to determine the subjects of discussion, and select the congregations, or committees, for the consideration of them. The reactionary party, represented by Caraffa and the Jesuits, triumphed over the evangelical Catholics. The council first took up the consideration, not of reforms, but of dogmas. It affirmed that tradition, as a source of knowledge, is of equal authority with the Scriptures. Emboldened by the success which Charles V. was gaining in the Smalcaldic War, it proceeded to assert the old doctrines with scarcely any modification. There were heated debates on the subject of justification. A party with a good degree of sympathy with the evangelical doctrine made itself heard, but the opposite view was affirmed in the definitions. The council asserted transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. Its labors, having been twice interrupted, were finally brought to an end in 1563, during the pontificate of Pius IV. Every attack on the papal power was skilfully turned aside. The conflicts at Trent left the Roman see stronger than before. The "Professio Fidei," or the brief formula of subscription to the Tridentine creed, to which all teachers and ecclesiastics were required to give their assent, contained a promise of obedience to the pope. But the council accomplished a positive work for the education of the

clergy and the better organization and discipline of the Church. It provided for the publication of a catechism, breviary, missal, and an authorized edition of the Vulgate. The creed of Trent set forth clearly and concisely the distinguishing points of the Catholic faith, and thus furnished a standard of orthodoxy far more satisfactory than the voluminous and often conflicting writings of the Fathers. The council, both by its doctrinal formulas and by its reformatory canons, contributed very much to the consolidation of the Church in a compact body.

But the leaders of the Catholic reaction were not content with merely fixing the stigma of heresy upon Protestantism by the authority of a general council. They were resolved to eradicate Protestantism by force. Even prior to the meeting of the assembly at Trent, the Inquisition had been reorganized, on the recommendation of Caraffa, who was to become its head, and, as Paul IV., was to be its chief patron. It was modelled after the Spanish Inquisition. The Holy Office had been set up in Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella, in the first instance for the purpose of discovering and punishing the converts from Judaism who returned to their former creed. But it proved to be so useful an engine of secular as well as of ecclesiastical tyranny that Ferdinand and his successors defended its obnoxious proceedings even against the objections and complaints of the pope. The atrocities of which it was guilty under Torquemada and the inquisitors-general who followed him, form a dark and repulsive page of Spanish history. It gained such a hold upon the bigoted and fanatical populace as to be almost able to defy the pope, and even the king himself. The Italian Inquisition was similar to it in being an independent ecclesiastical tribunal, with its own peculiar methods of procedure, but it was more directly dependent upon the will of the pope, and was less characterized by the gloomy spirit of religious frenzy. Six cardinals were made inquisitors-generals, with power to constitute inferior tribunals, and with authority on both sides of the Alps to imprison and to try all suspected persons, of whatever rank or order. The terrible machinery of this court was gradually set in motion in all the states of Italy. The open profession of Protestantism was instantly suppressed. Fugitives began to stream across the Alps. Ochino and Peter Martyr had already gone. In 1548 amazement was occasioned by the flight of Vergerio, Bishop of Capo d' Istria, who had been employed in important embassies by the pope. Those who did not escape were subjected to torture, imprisonment, and death. Among the dis-

tinguished men who suffered for their faith were Paleario and Carnesecchi. The Inquisition sought to destroy the books as well as the persons of the Protestants. In many places the book-trade was almost ruined. So vigilant were the officers of the Inquisition that of the thousands of copies of the book on the "Benefits of Christ" but few survived, and these have only been brought to

light within recent years. The "Index," which Caraffa
The Index. also introduced, contained the names of prohibited books, and a list of more than sixty printers all of whose publications were condemned. Caraffa was so anxious to keep the faithful sons of the Church from everything which had in it the slightest taint of heresy that he put upon the Index the very "Consilium" in which he, together with Sadolet and others, had advised Paul III. to check certain glaring ecclesiastical abuses. Later, under the auspices of Sixtus V., the "Index Expurgatorius" appeared, which condemned, not entire works, but particular passages in permitted books. The sweeping persecution which was undertaken by the reactionary party did not spare the evangelical Catholics. Even Cardinal Pole, the staunch defender of the unity of the Church, died in disgrace, and Cardinal Morone was imprisoned until the death of the inflexible Paul IV., in 1559, set him free. Such was the fierce bigotry which stamped out the sparks of heresy in Italy.

Protestantism was not without adherents even in Spain itself, the home of the Inquisition and of religious fanaticism. Spanish ecclesiastics and noblemen who attended Charles V. in
Protestantism in Spain. Germany, and were present at the Diet of Augsburg, or who sojourned in England after the marriage of Philip II. to Mary, became familiar with the Protestant doctrines, and not a few were inclined to adopt them. Luther's writings, and translations of the Bible into Spanish, were covertly introduced into Spain. Those who held the reformed opinions were especially numerous at Seville and Valladolid, and were there organized into secret churches. The most eminent preachers of Seville, Dr. John Egidius, and Constantine Ponce de la Fuente, who had been chaplain of the emperor, enlisted in the new movement. In Valladolid, likewise, the Protestants possessed a distinguished leader in the person of the imperial chaplain, Augustine Cazalla. In fact, the movement was confined, for the most part, to men of rank and learning. The discovery of these secret associations at Seville and Valladolid stimulated the Inquisition to redouble its vigilance. The flight of some facilitated the detection of those who remained behind. The dungeons were soon filled, and horrible implements of torture were

used to extort confessions, not only from men but from delicate and refined women. The autos da fé, or "acts of faith," which were held, in 1559 and 1560, in the two cities where heresy had taken root the most firmly, were arranged with a view to strike terror into the hearts of the sufferers themselves, and of the great throngs that gathered to watch the scene. The condemned, clad in a *san benito*, a coarse yellow frock upon which were worked in red, crosses, flames, and devils, were burned alive unless they would accept the offices of a priest, in which case they had the privilege of being strangled before the fire was lighted. The king, the royal family, and the great personages of the court were present to give countenance to these inhuman spectacles. Similar "acts of faith" took place in other cities. The highest ecclesiastics of the land did

Carranza, not escape persecution. Bartolomé de Carranza, Arch-
1503-1576. bishop of Toledo, and primate of Spain, was an evangelical Catholic, a friend of Pole, Morone, Flaminio, and other eminent Italians. He had advocated the doctrine of gratuitous justification at the Council of Trent, and at the bedside of the dying emperor, Charles V., had held up the crucifix, exclaiming: "Behold him who answers for all. There is no more sin; all is forgiven." He was accused before the Holy Office, and from that time until his death, eighteen years after, was under some species of confinement. The pretext for the accusation was a catechism from his pen which a commission of the Tridentine Council had approved. Bishops and doctors of theology who were suspected of holding similar views were likewise arraigned and compelled to make some retraction or to submit to public humiliation. It was thus that Protestant opinions were extirpated. Spain fell a victim to its own religious fanaticism. Centuries of intellectual bondage and lethargy were the heavy penalty paid for intolerance.

So vital was the force of the Catholic reaction that it went forward, notwithstanding the jealousy which for a time subsisted between those who were its natural leaders. When Caraf-
Paul IV.,
1555-1559. fa, at the age of seventy-nine, ascended the papal chair, his strongest passion seemed to be hatred of Charles V. and the Spaniards. In order to drive them out of Italy, this stern apostle of reform conferred offices and principalities on his unworthy nephews, enlisted German Protestants in his army, and even implored the Turk to come to his assistance. It was only the pious reverence of Philip II. for the head of the Church which saved Rome from being again sacked, and Paul IV. from suffering a humiliation at the hands of the Spanish monarch like that which

Charles had inflicted upon Clement. The pope now gave all his energies to the extermination of heresy and the purification of his court. He drove his unprincipled relatives in disgrace from his presence, and thus put an end to the nepotism which had so long been one of the worst evils of papal rule. The people signalized the death of the intolerant reformer by breaking into the dungeons of the Inquisition, liberating the prisoners, and setting fire to the buildings. But the spirit of the reaction outlived its energetic leader. It continued to pervade the Roman court, although

Pius IV.,
1559-1565.

Paul's successor, Pius IV., possessed little relish for the subtle distinctions of orthodoxy, and did not sympathize with the Inquisition. By his skilful negotiations with the different sovereigns, the papacy emerged from the Council of Trent without the loss of any of its valued prerogatives. The presence of his nephew, Carlo Borromeo, at the Roman court, gave it a tone of sobriety which Pius could not himself have imparted to it. Although of noble birth, Borromeo had resisted the temptations which lay in his path, and had devoted himself to the religious life with unwavering fidelity. He faithfully performed the duties of the great offices which the pope thrust upon him, and more than fulfilled the requirements of his archbishopric at Milan. Upon the death of his uncle he did not put forth his own claims to the pontificate.

Pius V.,
1566-1572.

but procured the election of Pius V., a rigid adherent of orthodoxy, and equally zealous for the reformation of the papacy and the destruction of heretics. Pius V. sympathized and co-operated with Spain in its warfare with Protestantism in the Netherlands, in France, and in England. The bull *in cœna Domini*, which was first framed in 1370, but did not grow to its complete form until 1627, was issued in 1567, in a new edition, by Pius, who ordered it to be read in the Catholic churches in all lands; but in several countries his command was not obeyed. In this famous bull, the anathema is pronounced on all classes of heretics and assailants of papal prerogatives. On the list of the cursed, after Lutherans, Calvinists, etc., and before Saracens and Turks, are the pirates infesting the sea bordering on the Pontifical state.

Science and
literature.

Meanwhile a striking change had taken place in the intellectual life of Italy. The old passion for antiquity gave way to a zeal for independent investigation, especially in natural science, until that study in turn was checked and repressed by the ecclesiastical rulers. Even reverence for ancient buildings was supplanted—in the mind of Sixtus V., for example—by the desire to rear edifices that might rival them.

1585-1590.

Poetry, painting, and music were pervaded by the religious temper of society, and by a spirit of loyalty to the Church.

This change was largely brought about through the influence of the Jesuits, into whose hands the education of youth, especially those of higher rank, had quickly fallen. Their labors were not confined to Italy. They established themselves in Spain and Portugal, and in their colonies. From the two peninsulas this great standing army of the pope advanced into the other countries of Europe to restore the power of Catholicism. It gained control over the University of Vienna; Cologne, Ingolstadt, and Prague were centres from which its members worked with great success in the Austrian dominions, the Rhenish provinces, and in other parts of Germany. They persuaded the Catholic princes to help forward the reactionary movement. It was mainly through their labors that in the last quarter of the sixteenth century the tide was turned against Protestantism in Southern Germany, in Bohemia, Moravia, Poland, and Hungary, countries in which it had, on the whole, gained the ascendancy. Wherever they did not prevail, they drew the lines of distinction between the two confessions more sharply, and intensified their mutual antagonism.

It may seem strange that Protestantism, which at first advanced so rapidly, and which seemed about to spread over all Europe, should suddenly be brought to a standstill, and even be thrust back from lands in which it had already gained a foothold. Protestantism was a movement of reform arising within the Church. Multitudes were at the outset not decided what course to adopt in regard to it. But as the ferment cooled down, men began to take sides, and when once the spirit of party was awakened, it formed an obstacle to the further progress of the new opinions. Still other barriers were erected by political arrangements. In Germany it was the application of the maxim "cujus regio ejus religio," and the "ecclesiastical reservation"; in France, the division of the people into two warring factions, Catholic and Huguenot; and in the Netherlands, the separation of the Walloon provinces from the other states. By the counter-reformation in the Roman Church the gross abuses which had been the principal ground of complaint were removed, and the Catholics were filled with zeal for the defence of the worship, the polity, and the doctrines of the Church. At the same time the Protestants were wasting their strength in contests with one another. Their secular leaders, like Maurice of Saxony and Queen Elizabeth, were not moved by the same noble devotion to the cause, which had ac-

Influence of
the Jesuits.

Causes of the
check of Prot-
estantism.

tuated the Electors Frederic and John, and even the Landgrave of Hesse. The Catholic Church was far better organized, and much freer from internal divisions. Within its fold was room for men of the most diverse temperaments and aims, men who in Protestant lands would, like Wesley at a later day, have been the founders of new sects. In Southern Europe, where the Catholic reaction was the most successful, the people were more firmly attached to the traditional system than were the Teutonic nations. In Italy and Spain, Protestantism did not reach down to the springs of national life. Even in France, it won its adherents for the most part from the middle and higher classes of society. Many of those who accepted the new doctrines were not inclined to cast off the polity and worship of the old Church. These were the causes which stayed the advance of Protestantism, and at length shut it up within fixed boundaries. But the Catholic party was not to remain free from internal discord. The theological conflicts which the Jesuits stirred up, together with other adverse influences, conspired finally to paralyze the Catholic reaction, and to stop the progress of the counter-reformation.

CHAPTER VIII.

CHRISTIANITY IN ENGLAND IN THE REIGNS OF JAMES I. AND CHARLES I.: THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR: THE PAPACY: THE EASTERN CHURCH.

THE accession of James I. brings us to the Puritan age of English history. At that time Puritanism did not mean hostility to Episcopal government or to the English liturgy. Presbyterianism there were who would have preferred another polity; but, generally speaking, while Puritans objected to prelat-
Character of Puritanism. ical tyranny, they had no quarrel with Episcopacy itself; and while certain amendments to the Prayer Book were deemed desirable, there were not many who were disposed to discard it altogether. Puritanism, at the accession of James, signified a thorough and inflexible antagonism to the Roman Catholic system of doctrine and of rule—an abhorrence of everything comprised under the term “popery.” It commonly meant Calvinism in theology. It meant always a spirit of resistance to arbitrary government on the part of the hierarchy, a demand for a more conscientious, diligent, and

better educated clergy, and a protest against pluralities and non-residence. No misapprehension can be greater than to suppose that the Puritans were, as a rule, inferior in rank and social standing, in wealth and in culture, to their opponents. Naturally the new nobility, the creation of the Tudors, who with the bishops made up the majority of the Upper House, were mostly devoted to the court, and to its ecclesiastical policy. But the House of Commons, where sat so many of the landed gentry, as well as numerous wealthy merchants, was Puritan through the whole reign of James. It was from the gentry, the merchants, and the professional class that Puritanism drew its chief support, although there were not wanting among its adherents noblemen of the highest rank, like the courtly Essex, who commanded the Parliamentary army in the war with Charles I. "The Memoir of Colonel Hutchinson," by his wife, shows what dignity of manners and refinement of culture might be found in a Puritan household. It was a party in which a man of the genius and accomplishments of Milton found himself

Later degeneracy of Puritanism.

at home. At a later day, when Puritanism was triumphant, it drew into its ranks insincere place-seekers, who exaggerated, while for a selfish purpose they copied, Puritan ways. By many, a sour visage came to be considered a proper badge of piety. Later still, under the disappointment of defeat and the pressure of persecution, the Puritan character became, in a degree, degenerate. Its manly sobriety passed into a forbidding austerity. Its elevation above the vices and frivolities of society turned into an almost cynical aversion to innocent gaiety and harmless recreations. But even in its period of decline, after the restoration of the Stuarts, it retained noble and worthy traits, hardly to be recognized under the caricatures which satirists delighted to present for the entertainment of the profligate despisers of all strictness of morality. There is truth in the observation that owing to the impression made by the reading of the Bible on the minds of the people, religion and theology, after the death of Elizabeth, absorbed attention, not without a loss of that versatility of genius, and that free and joyous spirit which had belonged to the bloom of the Renaissance—to the age of Shakespeare, Ben Jonson, and Raleigh. But there were compensations even for this loss. "The larger geniality of the age that had passed away"—writes a recent historian—"was replaced by an intense tenderness within the narrower circle of home. Home, as we conceive it now, was the creation of the Puritan. Wife and child rose from mere dependants on the will of husband or father, as husband or father saw in them

saints like himself, souls hallowed by the touch of a divine Spirit and called with a divine calling like his own."

On November 24, 1572, John Knox, the hero of the Scottish Reformation, died. His mental and moral energies were not impaired by his physical infirmity. It is related of him in his last days, by one who heard him preach, that, although he had to be lifted into the pulpit by two men, "before he had done with his sermon he was so active that he was like to ding that pulpit in blads and fly out of it." About three years before the death of Knox, the Regent Murray was assassinated. James, the heir of the throne, was less than four years old when the man who had held in subjection the different hostile factions was thus struck down. In the midst of their fierce rivalries the young king grew up. James I. merited the appellation of a "wise fool." He was shrewd and quick-witted, fertile in schemes for escaping a present difficulty, and not without considerable acquisitions in theology. But besides being a pedant, he lacked common sense, could never take a comprehensive view of a great question, and was inflated with self-conceit. The "kingcraft" of which he boasted did not rise above a superficial cleverness. In Scotland he had been in a constant struggle with the clergy, and had written the "Basilicon Doron" in order to inculcate into the mind of his son his cherished doctrine of the divine right of kings to do as they please—a doctrine that was eventually to bring ruin upon his house. He had made great endeavors to introduce bishops as a means of controlling the independent and refractory ministers of his native land, whose General Assembly was a kind of House of Commons, keeping watch over the sovereign, and seeing that he did not encroach on the rights claimed for the Church, or do anything to defile the purity of Christian teaching in the kingdom. In Scotland, after Presbyterianism was established, the old polity had remained as a matter of law. There were still bishops and abbots, having only a nominal function. These places were filled, after 1560, by Protestants, and often by laymen. It had been expected that the old offices would die out, but the nobles desired to absorb the revenues, and Parliament voted, in 1572, that they should continue—the bishops to have only the power of superintendents, and to be subject in spiritual things to the General Assembly. They were derisively called by the people "tulchan" bishops. In spite of the energetic resistance of Andrew Melville, who followed Knox as leader of the Presbyterian party, and was more uncompromising than Knox in his hostility to Episcopacy, an actual jurisdic-

James I.,
1603-1625.

tion was conferred on the prelates in 1584. But in the contest of England with Spain, James had to take sides with Elizabeth, and to drive into exile the Catholic lords on whom he relied for support in his conflict with the ministers; and in 1592 the act just referred to was repealed. Presbyterianism was re-established. After an interval, however, the battle between the king and the kirk was renewed. Melville went so far as to pluck James by the sleeve, and to call him "God's silly vassal." Parliament voted, in 1597, that the prelates should have a seat in their body. James only succeeded in procuring the addition of three bishops, to fill vacant sees, who were to have this same privilege. The result of his experience in his own realm was a cordial hatred of Presbyterianism on his part, as containing in it forces destructive of his theory of kingly prerogative. He remained a Calvinist in his opinions, and his conciliatory demeanor towards the Church of Rome, both before and after his assumption of the English crown, was dictated principally by political motives.

On his way to London, James was met by the "Millenary Petition," to which were attached the signatures of about eight hundred clergymen, belonging to twenty-five counties. They were not Separatists; they made no objection to Episcopacy. They complained of non-residence, pluralities, and like abuses, and of the cross in baptism, the cap and surplice, and a few other ceremonial peculiarities. In the Hampton Court Conference, which followed, the king summoned four leading Puritan divines, of whom Dr. Reynolds was the most prominent, to meet nine bishops, with seven deans and two other clergymen. There the Puritan complaints were discussed for three days, the king himself being the most active disputant, and showing an indecent readiness to browbeat the Puritan representatives, although at the beginning he checked the overbearing spirit of Bancroft, Bishop of London. James took occasion to say that a Scottish Presbytery "agrees with monarchy as well as God and the devil." "No bishop, no king," was his favorite maxim. The suggestion of Reynolds, that a new translation of the Scriptures should be issued, was heard with favor, on account of the objections of James to the notes of the Geneva Bible, then in common use, some of which were offensive to his notions of the sacredness of kings. The plan for the authorized version of the Bible, which was afterwards well carried out, was about the only good result of this Conference. James was delighted with the display which he made of his reasoning powers, and equally rejoiced

The Millenary
Petition.

The Hampton
Court Confer-
ence, Janu-
ary, 1604.

in the adulation offered him by the bishops, who were naturally overjoyed at his unexpectedly thorough support of their cause. Bancroft fell on his knees before him, saying that there had been no such king "since Christ's time." The aged Whitgift cried out, "Undoubtedly your majesty spake by the special assistance of God's Spirit." The proposition of the Puritan divines to incorporate the Lambeth Articles with the Anglican Creed was at variance with the more moderate and tolerant Calvinism of the king. He refused compliance, "being against increasing the number of articles, or stuffing them with theological niceties." In the course of the Conference, James said: "I will have one doctrine, one discipline, one religion in substance and ceremony." "If this be all your party have to say," he exclaimed, "I will make them conform or I will harry them out of this land, or else worse." Soon after, Whitgift died, and Bancroft succeeded to the archbishopric of Canterbury. He procured from Convocation, with the king's approval, the passage of a series of canons which forbade, under penalty of excommunication, the least deviation from the Prayer Book, or any disparagement of the established system of government and worship in the Church. The king found that the House of Commons was not at all in sympathy with his anti-Puritan policy, nor with his theory of absolute authority as inhering in himself as the Lord's anointed. In his speech to Parliament, he spoke of the Roman Church as the "mother church," although not free from corruptions, and wished that he might be the means of uniting the two religions. The policy of James was one impossible to carry out. He did not desire to treat Roman Catholics with severity. At the same time, he held it to be unsafe to let them increase in numbers. His commendable mildness towards them at the outset, was followed, therefore, by severe measures, which produced extreme irritation, and led, in 1605, to the abortive Gunpowder Plot. His forbearance in speaking of the Church of Rome, coupled with his violent denunciations of Puritanism, could not fail to excite anxiety and indignation among the zealous Protestants, who had not forgotten the conspiracies against Elizabeth and the Spanish Armada. From the beginning of James's reign there was a conflict between him and the Commons, who were determined to prevent him from usurping the prerogatives of an absolute prince, and to resist the efforts of subservient prelates to aid him in this endeavor and to extend the bounds of their spiritual jurisdiction at the expense of the proper authority of Parliament and of the liberty of the subject. Coke, the great champion of the common law, withstood the pretensions of Bancroft

Conflict with
the Commons.

As long as Cecil was in power, the foreign politics of James were not destitute of spirit. After the death of Cecil, James yielded to the influence of personal favorites—first, of Rochester, whom he made Earl of Somerset, and then of Buckingham. He abandoned the policy which Elizabeth had pursued, of aiding the Dutch in their struggle for liberty, and of upholding the Protestant cause on the Continent by doing battle against its most formidable adversary. He sought rather an alliance with Spain, which he flattered himself would be the best means of securing peace in Europe, and he strove to bring about a marriage of his oldest son, Charles, with a Spanish princess. To secure this last object he made large promises of indulgence to Roman Catholics, and made a sort of apology for applying the term “Antichrist” to

1613. Rome. His daughter Elizabeth had married the Elec-

tor Palatine. The offer of the Bohemian crown to the Elector, and the great contest which ensued upon his endeavor to maintain himself against the House of Austria, involved not only himself, but the whole Protestant interest on the Continent, in extreme peril. The Spanish court managed to keep back James from interference in behalf of his son-in-law, by holding out delusive hopes and promises, until it could unmask its real design, which was, not to marry the princess to Charles, but to send troops to seize on the Palatinate, and thus to open a road to its Belgian provinces, while striking an effective blow in behalf of the Austrian branch of the family, and against Protestantism. James succeeded, in 1610, in procuring the acceptance of Episcopacy, with limited

Bishops in Scotland. powers, in Scotland, Melville and other fearless leaders of the Presbyterians having been imprisoned and banished. By packing the assemblies of the clergy, and by other means of coercion, the king carried through this measure, on which he had long been bent. In 1618 the assembly at Perth was compelled to pass the “Five Acts,” which required kneeling at communion, and other observances, which in the Scottish Church were heartily disapproved. In 1610, a few days after consecrating the Scottish bishops, Bancroft died. Abbot, his successor, was well inclined to the Puritans. Their opponents were angry at his lenity and his laxness in enforcing uniformity. It is a sign of his Puritan proclivities that the organ and the choir were abolished in the

The authorized version. chapel at Lambeth. In 1611 the authorized version of the Scriptures was completed. It was a revision of the previous translations. Its unrivalled merits of style, its union of idiomatic vigor with rhythmic harmony, are familiar to all its read-

ers. A convert to the Church of Rome, in a well-known passage, thus speaks of the charm that resides in the English Bible: "It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten, like the sound of church-bells, which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness."

Of the character and conduct of Charles I., the noble wife of Colonel Hutchinson—a woman who was not blind to the faults of her own party—thus writes:

"The face of the court was much changed in the change of the king, for King Charles was temperate, chaste, and serious: so
Spirit and aims of Charles I., 1625-1649. that the fools and bawds, mimics and catamites, of the former court, grew out of fashion; and the nobility and courtiers, who did not quite abandon their debaucheries, yet so revered the king as to retire into corners to practise them. Men of learning and ingenuity in all arts were in esteem, and received encouragement from the king, who was a most excellent judge and a great lover of paintings, carvings, gravings, and many other ingenuities, less offensive than the bawdry and profane abusive wit which was the only exercise of the court.

"But, as in the primitive times, it is observed that the best emperors were some of them stirred up by Satan to be the bitterest persecutors of the Church, so this king was a worse encroacher upon the civil and spiritual liberties of his people by far than his father. He married a papist, a French lady, of haughty spirit, and a great wit and beauty, to whom he became a most uxorious husband. By this means the court was replenished with papists, and many who hoped to advance themselves by the change turned to that religion. All the papists in the kingdom were favoured, and, by the king's example, matched into the best families; the Puritans were more than ever discountenanced and persecuted, insomuch that many of them chose to abandon their country, and leave their dearest relations to retire into any foreign soil or plantation, where they might, amidst all outward inconveniences, enjoy the free exercise of God's worship. Such as could not flee were tormented in the bishops' courts, fined, whipped, pilloried, imprisoned, and suffered to enjoy no rest, so that death was better than life to them; and, notwithstanding their patient sufferance of all these things, yet was not the king satisfied till the whole land was reduced to perfect slavery. The example

of the French king was propounded to him, and he thought himself no monarch so long as his will was confined to the bounds of the law ; but knowing that the people of England were not pliable to an arbitrary rule, he plotted to subdue them to his yoke by a foreign force, and till he could effect it, made no conscience of granting anything to the people which he resolved should not oblige him longer than it served his turn ; for he was a prince that had nothing of faith or truth, justice or generosity in him. He was the most obstinate person in his self-will that ever was, and so bent on being an absolute, uncontrollable sovereign, that he was resolved either to be such a king or none. His firm adherence to prelacy was not for conscience of one religion more than another, for it was his principle that an honest man might be saved in any profession ; but he had a mistaken principle that kingly government in the State could not stand without episcopal government in the Church ; and, therefore, as the bishops flattered him with preaching up his sovereign prerogative, and inveighing against the Puritans as factious and disloyal, so he protected them in their pomp and pride, and insolent practices against all the godly and sober people of the land."

That Charles was determined to be an absolute monarch, and that he was habitually faithless to his pledges, are the two facts of prime importance. There is no reason to doubt that he was a sincere Protestant, but his conduct was such as to excuse the suspicion that he was not. His treatment of papists, as was true of James I., was vacillating. Now the laws against them would be executed, and now the enforcement of them would be illegally suspended by the king's decree. It was characteristic of him that, after the rupture with Spain, he sent troops, in 1625, to aid Louis XIII. in the capture of Rochelle, thus giving great offence to the Protestants, while he arranged that there should be a mutiny against the captains of his vessels when they were to sail. The detection of this double-dealing was one of the causes that brought on war between England and France. The failure of Buckingham's expedition for the relief of Rochelle in 1627 was followed by the Petition of Right, the great protest of Parliament against arbitrary government. One of the supporters of this measure was Wentworth, afterward the Earl of Strafford, who went over to the side of the king, and in Ireland set about the forming of a military force which might be used in maintaining the usurpations of Charles. Religion became inseparably mingled with political strife. The principal agent on the ecclesiastical side,

Treatment of
Roman Cath-
olics.

in supporting the king's scheme of absolutism, was William Laud, who was made Bishop of London in 1628, and, five years later, was promoted to the see of Canterbury. In some respects, the adversaries of Laud have not done him full justice. Whoever will read his principal work—his "Conference," in answer to the Jesuit, Fisher—will see that he was a discriminating theologian. The passage, for example, on the relation of faith to reason is one of marked ability. In one sense, he was a liberal-minded theologian. He thought it sufficient that there should be "a consent to articles in general." By "requiring assent to particulars," he said, the Church "hath been rent." He was an honest man, and honest in his profession of Protestantism. In his

Laud, 1573-1645.

His theology.

exposition of the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, he does not go beyond the position of Calvin on the point of the real presence, and he appeals to Calvin as one who shares his opinion. Bellarmine, he says, has misrepresented Calvin. "Calvinists," he affirms with truth, "maintain a most true and real presence." We offer up, he alleges, only a commemoration of the body and blood of Christ. There is no offering in the sacrament except "a memory" of the sacrifice of Christ, an offering of praise and thanksgiving, and a self-surrender of the communicant to God. Laud was not willing to style Rome "Antichrist," and this was one of the charges against him at his trial. The Church of Rome, he held, was a corrupted but not an apostate Church. But this opinion he entertained in common with Protestant leaders of highest worth, and with most Protestant divines at the present day. The faults of Laud were, first, those of temper. His intellect was narrow, and with this lack of breadth there was coupled a hard, inflexible disposition. He was a martinet in all matters of ritual. He

His Ritualism.

attached an immense importance to externals in religion, and to uniformity in the ceremonies of worship. By such means he believed that inward piety was best promoted. Joined with this fixed idea was a sacerdotal theory of apostolic succession, which tended to carry him farther away from the other Protestant churches than from the Church of Rome. He wrote to Bishop Hall that in speaking of the foreign Protestant churches he had been "a little more favorable than our case will now bear." Parity of the clergy he pronounced "the mother of confusion." In his zeal for uniformity in worship, he undertook to break up the foreign congregations which had so long been hospitably allowed to worship in England in their own way. The Puritans saw that his anti-Calvinistic theology, however it may be judged at pres-

ent, was nearer to the theology of the champions of Rome than to that of the Reformers. All his proceedings appeared to be parts of a retrograde movement towards the mediæval system. His maxim that, "Unity cannot long continue in the Church when uni-

formity is shut out at the Church doors," he thought it

His tyranny.

right to enforce by a vigilant and merciless persecution of even slight deviations from the appointed order, including the ceremonies which he had himself introduced. Puritan ministers were punished for not reading in churches the "Book of Sports," which recommended the people to engage in games and pastimes at the close of service on Sunday, some of which, independently of the day, very many religious men did not approve. This was the "Declaration," in an amplified form, which James I., in 1618, had required the clergy of Lancashire to read in public to their flocks. The Court of High Commission, a species of Protestant inquisition, afforded to the primate the means of enforcing his tyrannical measures. The attacks upon the prelates and upon prelacy which were provoked by this persecution were often of an angry and abusive character. The authors of them, when they were discovered, were made to suffer cruel penalties. The Star Chamber and the High Commission are emblems, as they were effective instruments, of the ecclesiastical and civil tyranny to which the English people were subjected. In the great attempt to enable Charles to raise money, and to govern with absolute authority, without a Parliament, Laud, in his sphere, was the ally, as he was the personal friend, of Strafford, and regretted that he could not carry out to the full the policy of "Thorough," since the more favorable circumstances of the latter in Ireland rendered it practicable for him to tread down all opposition. The endeavor to force the

Introduction
of Episcopacy
into Scotland.

English Prayer Book, as well as a complete government of bishops, upon Scotland—a scheme as unwise as it was unrighteous—led to the adoption, in 1638, of the National Covenant of the Scots for the defence of Presbyterianism. A wave of devout and patriotic enthusiasm swept over the land. Scottish soldiers who had been fighting for the Protestant faith under Gustavus Adolphus hurried across the sea to join their countrymen, who with one accord took up arms in defence of their rights and their religion. Speaking of Scotland, James had once said of Laud, "He knows not the stomach of that people."

The Long Parliament assembled in 1640. Strafford was impeached, and the ministers of Charles were driven from their places. When the king wrote to the foreign Protestant churches,

denying the charge that he intended to introduce and cherish popery, he spoke the truth as regards both himself and Laud. Nevertheless, papists, as well as zealous Protestants, alike felt that the king and the primate were working efficiently, even if unconsciously, in behalf of the Church of Rome. The "Anglo-Catholic theology"—the way of thinking represented by such men as Laud and Bishop Andrewes—with its doctrine of the necessity of episcopal ordination to the exercise of the ministry in any church, its feeling of the exalted importance of the sacraments among the means of grace, and with the ritualistic spirit with which it was imbued, had been growing up since the last days of Elizabeth's reign. To the multitude of Anglican Protestants, to whom Rome was still the mystic Babylon, and the pope Antichrist, this type of religion was odious. It was the attempt to force his system on the country, and his willingness to break down the safeguards of liberty and to overthrow parliamentary government to secure the end in view, that brought ruin upon Laud. To an increasing number, episcopal tyranny was making the very name of "bishop" obnoxious. How deep this antipathy became in minds inspired with a passion for liberty, is evinced in the eloquent, even if intemperate, invectives of Milton. Yet at the opening of the Long Parliament a great majority were disposed to go no farther than to restore the Church to the condition in which it was under Elizabeth, and to abolish the "innovations" brought in by Laud. But as the conflict grew hot, and the prelates stood firmly by the king, it was not thought enough to expel them from the House of Lords. The Presbyterian party grew in numbers. It owed its final victory to the refusal of the Scots to combine with Parliament against the king, unless uniformity in the ecclesiastical system could be established in both countries by the adoption in England of the Presbyterian polity. In 1643, Parliament swore to the Solemn League and Covenant, and engaged to extirpate "popery, prelacy, superstition, schism, and profaneness." Strafford had been executed more than two years before. The Scots were inexorable in demanding the punishment of Laud, and on the 10th of January, 1645, he was sent to the block. Baneful as his career had been, it is impossible to read the closing address and the prayer of this aged man on the scaffold, without sensations of respect and pity. It is a prayer in pleasing contrast with some of his petitions to God, recorded in connection with his diary—for example, with one of the prayers for the powerful courtier, Buckingham: "Continue him a

The measures of the Long Parliament.

Hatred of prelacy.

Adoption of the covenant.

May 12, 1641.

true-hearted friend to me, Thy poor servant, whom Thou hast honored in his eyes."

In 1642, before adopting the covenant, Parliament had called together the Westminster Assembly to advise them in the matter of reconstructing the Church of England. One hundred and twenty-one divines, many of them men of great learning and weight, were invited to be members. Ussher and a few other prelates were appointed to sit in this body, but their loyalty to the king, and the control exercised by the Presbyterian party in the Assembly, prevented them, with one or two exceptions, from attending the sessions. Another party in the body, small in numbers, but respectable from the high character of the individuals comprising it, was that of the Independents. The Brownists, as the Independents were first called, had been driven out of the kingdom in the preceding reigns. The Plymouth settlement in Massachusetts had been formed by the exiled church of John Robinson. The Puritans who had settled Massachusetts had become practically Independents. Men of this party were now returning to England from Holland, and some, including Hugh Peters, were coming back from New England, to take their share in the stirring events in the home country. The Independents were averse to established churches, asserted the right of the congregation to govern itself, and were commonly for a larger measure of toleration than the Presbyterians approved. The Westminster Assembly began a revision of the Thirty-nine Articles, introducing among the changes more definite assertions of Calvinism; but the union of Parliament with the Scots called them away from this task. The prospect of the establishment of a moderate episcopacy now vanished. The Westminster Confession, and the Longer and Shorter Catechisms, together with a Directory for Worship, were framed and were approved by Parliament. While the Presbyterian system was adopted, it was never fully carried into effect in England. Parliament steadily refused to yield up its own supremacy as a court of ultimate appeal. It would not allow to the Church the complete right to excommunicate its members, or to interdict communion. In consequence of the growing strength of the Independents, and the authority acquired by Cromwell, Presbyterianism, in the main features of its polity, was never fully established in more than two counties, Middlesex and Lancashire. In their doctrinal definitions the Westminster Assembly set forth the Calvinistic system, not in the extreme, supralapsarian form, which made the first sin of Adam

The Westminster Assembly.

The Westminster creeds.

the product of an effective, rather than a permissive, decree. Yet it put God's decrees in the foreground, in conjunction, however, with the doctrine of covenants of works and of grace, made by God with man. The direct assertion of the "reprobation" of sinful men is avoided. Yet it is said that God purposed "to pass by" the non-elect and to ordain them to the suffering of the penalty of their sin, for the glory of his justice. On the subject of redemption, the English representatives at the Synod of Dort had shown some disposition to modify the usual Calvinistic statement of an intention of God to save, which is *limited* to the elect, and to favor the idea of a design on his part, through the death of Christ, to provide a *possible* salvation for all, in case they should repent. This tendency to a more liberal view of the range of the purpose of redemption, was approved by some in the Assembly, but fails of any distinct expression in their creeds. In one place it is only "the elect" who are said to be "redeemed" by Christ. The Puritan view of the ground of the obligation to observe the Sabbath is affirmed. The Christian magistrate has no right to administer the word or the sacraments, or to exercise the power of the keys; but he is bound to suppress all heresies, as well as blasphemies, and may both call synods and exercise a certain superintendence over them, to see that their transactions are "according to the mind of God." The Directory issued by the assembly, contained injunctions respecting public worship, and copious suggestions in relation to the proper topics of prayer. The Prayer Book was now abolished, and between one and two thousand ministers, who refused the new subscriptions, were deprived of their places. A majority of the framers of the new creeds believed in the divine right of Presbyterianism. They considered it a duty of the state to enforce uniformity, and were not prepared to make concessions of any importance to the Independents. In 1648, Parliament passed an act of an extremely intolerant character. Eight errors—one of which is the denial of the two natures of Christ—are made punishable with death. For the profession of any one of sixteen specified opinions—one of which is the unlawfulness of infant baptism, and another that God may be worshipped by pictures or images—imprisonment is ordained until sureties shall be found that the offending party shall not any more publish or maintain his error. The military power of the Independents, with Cromwell for their leader, and the new organization of the army—the "New Model"—which was occasioned by the languid prosecution of the war by Essex, rendered it impossible to put this

Cromwell
and the In-
dependents.

harsh statute in execution. The control of the army, which, on the one hand, would neither suffer the dissidents from the Presbyterian system to be put down, nor permit the king to be spared, brought on the conflict of Cromwell with the Scots. His victory over them was succeeded by "Pride's purge," when forty members were excluded from Parliament by military force. The trial of Charles ensued, and then his execution, on the 30th of January, 1649.

In 1658, in the last days of Cromwell, he permitted a synod of Independents or Congregationalists to meet, and to frame the Savoy Declaration of the faith and order of their churches.

The Savoy
Declaration.

Its doctrinal parts were mainly copied from the Westminster creeds. As regards toleration, its position was in accord with the statement in its preface, that "there ought to be vouchsafed a forbearance and mutual indulgence unto saints of all persuasions, that keep unto, and hold fast, the necessary foundations of faith and holiness, in all other matters extra-fundamental, whether of faith or order." Religious liberty was claimed for those "holding the foundation" and "not disturbing others in their ways or worship."

In the early part of the seventeenth century, while the Roman Catholic forces in Europe were becoming more and more concentrated, Protestantism was weakened by bitter intestine conflicts. France, and the opposition of France to the ambition of the Spanish-Austrian family, were one main dependence of Protestantism in its struggle with its adversaries. The assassination of Henry IV., in 1610, took away for a long time this source of hope and of help. James I. of England was engaged in quarrels with his Parliaments, in the persecution of Puritanism, and in delusive schemes of personal advantage and of political influence to be obtained by means of a connection with Spain. In the Netherlands, the conflict between Calvinists and Arminians culminated in the condemnation of the latter by the Synod of Dort (in 1618-19), and in the execution, on May 13, 1619, of the great statesman and patriot, John of Barneveld, the defender of the Arminian principle of the control of the Church by the State. By him the desire of Maurice, Prince of Orange, to obtain supreme power had been thwarted, and against Maurice's will, a twelve years' truce had been concluded with Spain. Grotius was condemned to perpetual imprisonment, and escaped from confinement only through the ingenuity and heroism of his wife. The hostility of the Lutherans to Calvinism made the Lutheran princes in Germany

Divisions of
Protestants.

deaf to the entreaties of their Dutch neighbors and brethren for aid in the long-continued struggle with Spain. In Germany itself, what was called Crypto-Calvinism, the creed of the disciples of Melanchthon's theology, who refused to accept the Form of Concord which was framed by its adversaries in 1576, was denounced by many strict Lutherans as a damnable heresy. Nicholas Crell, Chancellor of Saxony, had endeavored to introduce there this modified type of Calvinism. On the death of Christian I., in 1591, he was dismissed from his post, was imprisoned, and finally, in 1601, was beheaded at Dresden. The result of the doctrinal battles between the two parties in Germany was that several states, including the Palatinate, became permanently dissevered from Lutheranism, and connected with the Reformed branch of the Protestant Church. The bitter spirit in which theological debates were carried forward in Germany in this period may be inferred from the circumstance that on a sheet of paper which Melanchthon left on his table, a few days before his death, were written several reasons why he was less reluctant to die, and that one of them was the prospect of escaping from the fury of theologians—"rabie theologorum." A half-century after he died, the leading theologian at Wittenberg was so enraged at hearing him referred to by a student as an authority for some doctrinal statement that, before the eyes of all, he tore his portrait from the wall and trampled on it.

The provisions of the Treaty of Passau were strictly observed neither by the Protestant nor the Catholic states. The Protestants did not acknowledge the validity of the Ecclesiastical Reservation. Not only was Church property in the different Protestant states confiscated, but in some cases, in the ecclesiastical princedoms, Protestant "administrators" were appointed in the room of the Catholic bishops; and for them the rights of bishops in the diet were claimed. For a time the Emperors had been impartial in their treatment of the rival confessions. This was true of Ferdinand I. (1556-1564), and especially of Maximilian II. (1564-1576), who had no sympathy with the Catholic zealots who instigated such crimes as the massacre of St. Bartholomew. But his successor, Rudolph II. (1576-1612), who had been brought up in Spain, was in full sympathy with the Jesuits and with the Catholic reaction. The same spirit characterized Matthias (1612-1619), who succeeded him, and Ferdinand of Styria, the next emperor (1619-1637). Ferdinand, and Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, were the devoted champions of the Catholic reaction. There were outbreaks of violence between the adherents of the

Origin of the
Thirty Years'
War.

two confessions. A Catholic procession was insulted at Donauwörth, a free city of the empire. The city was put under the ban by the Emperor. The Bavarian duke marched against it and incorporated it in his own territory. The Palatinate and the other Calvinistic states, which were not included in the privileges of the treaty of Passau, more and more felt disposed to forestall the attacks which they had reason to fear, by a resort to arms. Their most active leader was Christian of Anhalt. In 1608, after the outrage at Donauwörth, a Protestant league had been formed, the organization of which, however, was weak in comparison with that of the Catholic league, which, under the leadership of Maximilian of Bavaria, was formed to oppose it. The immediate occasion of the Thirty Years' War was the acceptance by Frederic V., the Elector Palatine, of the crown of Bohemia, which that nation, refusing to acknowledge Ferdinand as its king, offered to him.

1619.

Ferdinand, a nursling of the Jesuits, who had early taken a vow to extirpate heresy in his dominions, threw himself, as much from necessity as from choice, into the arms of the Catholic League. The two branches of the Hapsburg family, the Austrian and Spanish, were now once more united by religious sympathies. The Elector, whose obtrusive Calvinism was unpopular in Bohemia, and who received little help from England and from the Lutheran princes, was overwhelmed with defeat. The consequence was that

1623.

Bohemia was abandoned to fire and sword. The Palatinate was conquered and devastated by the troops of Tilly, and the electoral dignity was transferred to Bavaria. The intervention of England, Denmark, and Holland, in 1625, was of no avail. The Catholics now had a majority in the electoral college. But the interests of Maximilian and Ferdinand were no longer the same, and they became rivals. By the consummate ability of Wallenstein, the Emperor was able to break loose from his dependence on the League. Germany was a prey to myriads of lawless, mercenary troops. Ferdinand was induced by the League,

1630.

jealous of the power and ambition of Wallenstein, to remove him from his command. Moreover, Ferdinand weakened his cause by the Edict of Restitution, issued in 1629, in which the most extreme claims made by Catholic interpreters of the Treaty of Passau were declared. It was evident that nothing less was aimed at than the entire extinction of Protestantism. The lukewarm princes, including the Electors of Brandenburg and Saxony, were roused to a sense of their own danger.

Edict of
Restitution.

The Thirty Years' War was a long and terrible tragedy. The

second act in the drama brings upon the stage Gustavus Adolphus, whose sincere attachment to the Protestant faith is unquestionable, although it was connected with a pardonable desire to build up the power of Sweden, and, possibly, with an aspiration after the imperial crown. The victories of the Swedish hero compelled the recall to service of Wallenstein. Gustavus fell in the moment of victory, at Lutzen, in 1632.

Intervention
of Sweden,
1630.

The influence of Richelieu, the great French statesman who revived the anti-Austrian policy of Henry IV., the traditional resistance of France to the efforts of the House of Hapsburg to build up a universal monarchy, now becomes prominent. In 1633 France, in the Heilbronn Treaty, formed an alliance with Sweden and with the Protestant states of Germany. After the imperial victory at Nördlingen in 1634, the aid of France became indispensable. Brandenburg and Saxony, moved by hostility to Sweden, made a separate treaty with the emperor. In Saxony, the hostility to Calvinism neutralized the feeling of repugnance to such an arrangement. The character of the war during this decade entirely changed. Protestant states were fighting on the imperial side, and paying a heavy price for the desertion of their former allies. It was not until 1648 that the obstinacy of the court of Vienna was overcome by military reverses, and the Edict of Restitution was given up.

Intervention
of France.

The cruelties inflicted during this war upon the defenceless people are indescribable. The unarmed were treated with brutal ferocity. The population of Germany is said to have diminished in thirty years from twenty to fifty per cent. There were four hundred thousand people in Würtemberg; in 1641 only forty-eight thousand were left. In fertile districts, owing to the destruction of the crops, great numbers perished by famine. More frightful than famine were the immorality and the moral decay which ensued upon the long reign of violence.

Effects of the
war.

The Peace of Westphalia, in 1648, was a great European settlement. It was agreed that in Germany, whatever might be the faith of the prince, the religion of each state was to be Catholic or Protestant according to its position in 1624, which was fixed upon as the "normal year." In imperial affairs, equality was established between the two religions. Religious freedom and civil equality were extended to the Calvinists. The empire was reduced to a shadow by giving to the Diet the power to decide in all important matters, and by the permission given to its members to make alliances with one another and with foreign

The Peace of
Westphalia.

powers, with only the futile proviso that no prejudice should come thereby to the empire or the emperor. The independence of Holland and of Switzerland was acknowledged. The great war in the Netherlands, which had lasted for eighty years, was thus brought to an end. Sweden was strengthened in the region of the Baltic, and obtained a place in the German Diet. The genius of Gustavus Adolphus had created a new Protestant power in the North. Among the gains of France were the three bishoprics, Metz, Toul, and Verdun, and Upper and Lower Alsace. The German Empire thenceforth existed only in name. France had extended her boundaries and disciplined her troops. The losses to Protestantism were heavy indeed. The wrangles about the ubiquity of Christ's body, and the petty rivalries of dukes and electors, had brought on the Protestant interest in Germany, and on the whole fatherland, terrible calamities. It may, perhaps, be regarded as some compensation that Sweden became a strong state, while Austria and Spain were partially disabled.

Notwithstanding the reign of the Catholic reaction, and the fanaticism developed by it, the popes found it impossible to revive the authority in political concerns which had been exerted by the mediæval pontiffs. Sixtus V. (1585-1590), who was full of energy in the administration of his own states and fertile in grand schemes for extending the bounds of the Church, when he was disposed to be lenient to Henry IV., was confronted by a peremptory remonstrance from Spain. The elements that were dividing the world, as Ranke has said, "filled his very soul with the confusion of their conflict." He rendered service to the cause of learning by establishing the printing-press of the Vatican, where the Septuagint was published in 1587, and soon after the Vulgate, as directed by the Council of Trent; but it was found to contain so many errors that a corrected edition had to be prepared under the auspices of his successor. Clement VIII. (1592-1605) absolved Henry IV. from excommunication, and with aid from him took possession of Ferrara as an escheated fief. Through his influence the Peace of Verviers between France and Spain was concluded in 1598, and the balance of power was restored between the two countries. Paul V. (1605-1621) combined with severity in enforcing the canons of the Church the highest idea of pontifical authority. This he undertook to assert in relation to Venice, which, among other offences, had forbidden the increase of the

possessions of the Church in real estate. When his mandates were disregarded, he excommunicated the Senate, and laid the Republic under an interdict. This was not heeded by the Venetian clergy, and when peace was made, in 1607, with the domineering pontiff through the mediation of France, Venice did not relinquish anything substantial in its claims. Gregory XV. (1621–

Gregory XV. 1623) established the methods of electing and consecrating a pope which are still in force, gave a firm foundation to the Congregation of the Propaganda for the support and direction of missions, was the protector of the Capuchins, and canonized the founders of the Jesuit order, Loyola and Xavier. Urban VIII.

(1623–1644), hostile from political considerations to Spain and Austria, lent his support to France and Richelieu in the great war in Germany. Once more the papacy was helping on the Protestant cause, to the intense disgust and displeasure of the emperor and his allies. Afterwards the protests of Urban and of Innocent X. (1644–1655) against the concessions made by treaty to the Protestants had no effect. It was during the pontificate of Urban that the opinions of Jansenius were condemned, and Galileo was driven to revoke his scientific doctrines.

Among the new orders which arose under the popes referred to above, the Benedictine Congregation of St. Maur, organized in 1618 in France, distinguished itself through the scholars connected with it, and by its excellent literary labors—especially by its edition of the Church Fathers.

The Benedictines of St. Maur.

The Protestants felt a strong interest in the Greek Church, for the reason that it disowned the papacy. The efforts made by them

The Greek Church. were, however, repelled by the Eastern ecclesiastics.

An attempt was made by Cyril Lucar, a Greek Christian, to graft Protestantism, in the Calvinistic form, on to the Oriental Church. He was a native of Crete, journeyed extensively in Europe, and in Switzerland adopted the Protestant faith. Returning to the East, he was made Patriarch of Alexandria in 1602, and of Constantinople in 1621. He corresponded with Protestant divines in Europe. In 1633, a confession of faith, written by him, and Protestant in its theological cast, was published. But the Jesuits were active in their intrigues against him. His printing-press was destroyed. Several times he was deposed and reinstated in his office, and he was finally put to death by the Sultan, in 1638, on the charge of high treason. No important results of a permanent character followed from his labors.

The Russian Church gradually became independent of Constantinople. In 1589 a patriarchate was established at Moscow ; but, until the middle of the seventeenth century, the incumbents of the office had to have their appointments confirmed by the patriarch of the ancient Eastern capital. Efforts made to unite the Russian Church with Rome were ineffectual, save in the case of provinces which were acquired by Poland. As a shield against Rome and Protestantism, the "Orthodox Confession of Mogilas" was drawn up about the year 1640, by the Metropolitan of Kieff, and was afterwards subscribed by the four Eastern patriarchs. In 1672 the Synod of Jerusalem framed an elaborate confession, in which Greek orthodoxy is defined. It includes an assertion of transubstantiation, and a doctrine of purgatory not essentially dissonant from that of the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER IX.

POLITY AND WORSHIP IN PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

It were unreasonable to expect that the religious revolution of the sixteenth century would solve the problems connected with the relations of Church and State. These problems grow out of the nature of religion and of civil society.

The relations
of Church
and State.

Even the "modern ideal" of "a free Church in a free State" leaves unsettled the proper boundaries of the civil authority. The question of education, for example, furnishes to-day material for controversies not easy of adjustment. Other difficulties are likely to arise, when a powerful religious organization, like the Church of Rome, claims the right to define the limits of State authority, and to control the consciences of a multitude of citizens who are banded together under its hierarchy. But the modern ideal, whatever advantages and whatever evils belong to it, was foreign to the thoughts of men in the age of the Reformation. To get rid of the yoke of the papacy was to bring in, as the immediate result, separate national churches. Religion, it had always been felt by thoughtful men, is the basis of morality, and religion and morality lie at the foundation of the State. Cicero says that he knows not but that, if piety were extinguished, "good faith, the social union of mankind, and justice, the highest of virtues, would likewise perish." Plutarch says that we can more easily suppose a

city to exist without house or ground than a state without belief in the gods. But the dictates of religion are supreme. What shall be done when its promptings clash with the policy and ordinances of civil rulers? Moreover, religion is a bond between man and man. It cannot be restricted by geographical limits. The relation of the organized Christianity of any particular civil community to the Church as a whole is to be determined. One mode

Possible unity
of Church and
State.

of avoiding a conflict of Church and State was found in the absolute blending of the two, as in Islamism, where the Koran is the law-book in religion and in temporal concerns, and where the caliph was supreme in both provinces. In the ancient Jewish system there was likewise a theocracy. There was a code for belief and worship, and for all the concerns which fall under the head of state-law. In the middle ages the solution was sought in the control of the State by the Church, under the theory that temporal as well as spiritual authority is derived from the pope. It is the theory of a dominant hierarchy, such as existed in ancient Egypt and the Eastern nations. Among the Greeks and Romans, on the contrary, unity was secured by the control of religion by the State. Religion was a department of State. This might be, as long as there was only one mind as to faith and worship, and as long as religion was conceived of as purely a national affair. But when a dissenter, like Socrates, arose, and when religion came to be seen to be something universal in its character, the Græco-Roman theory was shaken.

The Reformers generally agreed in discarding the hierarchical idea, and in holding that the body of the Church is the original repository of ecclesiastical authority. It was government by the laity, in distinction from government by a priestly class. Luther says, in his "Address to the Nobles:" "Man's invention has discovered that the pope, the bishops, the priests, and the monks, are called the spiritual or ecclesiastical state; and that the princes, nobles, citizens, and peasants are called the secular state or laity. A fine story, forsooth; but let no man be terrified by such fictions. All Christians belong to the spiritual state; nor is there any other difference between them than that of the functions which they discharge. We have all one baptism, one faith; and it is this alone which makes the spiritual man or the Christian nation." Luther declared that in the hands of the body of believers are the keys, or the right to exercise church discipline, the sacraments, and all the powers of government. The clergy are commissioned to perform offices which belong to all in common,

Luther on
the powers of
the laity.

but which all cannot discharge. Ordination is nothing but the rite whereby persons are put into the ministry ; but they are not constituted an order of priests. To the Church belongs the right of self-government, including the right to call and ordain ministers, and the power of excommunication.

These abstract doctrines, if carried out, would have confined the civil authority within limits much narrower than those actually fixed by the Saxon Reformers. Luther considered that the Germans were too rough and turbulent, and too unpractised in self-government, to take ecclesiastical power into their hands at once. The princes, the principal members of the Church, must take the lead in ecclesiastical arrangements, and the people must conform to them. The Peasants' War and the strife with the Anabaptists had the effect of producing a strong reaction against anything that looked towards the divesting of the magistrate of his authority. While the Augsburg Confession restricts the jurisdiction of civil rulers to temporal affairs, yet, as special questions arise, Luther and Melanchthon give to them a much larger measure of authority. They consider them authorized to punish offences against the first table of the law, and they make this office to include the right and the obligation to abolish the mass. Yet both the Saxon leaders—Melanchthon, with great emphasis—predict the tyranny which the rulers are likely to exercise in relation to the Church. The Peace of Augsburg, which made the religion of each community to be determined by the religion of the prince, the only escape for dissenters being the privilege of emigration, brought after it, in Lutheran communities, an abundant fulfilment of these sagacious prophecies. The local ruler became the supreme director in the affairs of religion, with a clerical synod for his advisers. There was thus an essential departure from the principles of Luther, both as to the extension of the magistrate's authority and the proper relation of the clergy to the congregation. The only right left to the churches in the election of pastors was that of confirming or rejecting the nominations made by the patrons.

In Hesse a remarkable attempt was made by Francis Lambert to establish what may be called a Congregational system with an infusion of Presbyterian elements. The plan was devised at the Synod of Homburg in 1526. Luther was consulted, approved of the scheme in the abstract, but pronounced it impracticable. Such a mass of new laws, he said, could not be introduced : law must be a historical growth. The Hessian constitution was never fully set in operation.

Ecclesiastical
power given
to magis-
trates.

The Hom-
burg Synod.

The two principal characteristics of the Lutheran polity were the superintendents and the consistories. In 1527, at the request of the theologians, visitors to the Saxon churches were appointed by the elector. By them a uniform system for government and worship was introduced, which was drawn up by Melancthon. Superintendents were appointed, who exercised a sort of episcopal oversight, each within his own district. The consistories arose from the need of competent tribunals to adjudicate upon questions relating to marriage and divorce. The abolition of the canon law, many of the provisions of which were repugnant to Protestant principles, and the loss of the old episcopal tribunals, brought numerous and perplexing questions on these subjects before the Lutheran pastors. Letters were frequently addressed to Luther and to his associates on matters of this kind. The canon law put so many impediments in the way of lawful marriage that it had been easy for ecclesiastics to find a pretext for dissolving it. The malpractice of the Catholic tribunals in granting dispensations, and in declaring marriages invalid, and the uncertainty in which the Reformers found themselves at first on ethical points, where they could no longer follow the traditional usages of the Church, must be taken into account in judging of the errors into which they occasionally fell—the most serious of which was the allowance of a second marriage to the Landgrave of Hesse, although his wife, between whom and her husband all conjugal intercourse had ceased, was still living. Marriage was denied by Luther to be a sacrament. It was valid, therefore, if concluded by civil contract alone, according to forms prescribed by law. But a religious service was considered appropriate. Ethical questions were involved in connection with the dissolving of the marriage-tie. Hence mixed tribunals were constituted, partly of the clergy and partly of jurists; and to these the whole ecclesiastical administration, including the right of excommunication, was committed. In Brandenburg and Prussia, the episcopal system continued until 1587. In Denmark the bishops, in 1536, gave way to superintendents, who were appointed by the king. In Sweden the office of bishop was retained.

The course of events in Germany had brought the government of the Church into the hands of the Protestant princes within their respective states. Theologians and jurists proposed various theories in explanation or justification of this fact. At the beginning of the seventeenth century, the “episcopal system” was advocated, according to which the civil

The Lutheran polity.

The consistories.

Theories as to the ecclesiastical rule of princes.

rulers were held to have received their ecclesiastical powers from the emperor, by the Treaty of Passau and the Peace of Augsburg. Some held that these powers were provisionally bestowed, by "devolution," until the opposing churches should be reunited ; others, that they were now restored to the place to which they had originally and rightfully belonged. At the end of the seventeenth century, the "territorial system" was set up, in which episcopal authority—*jus episcopale*—was identified with the conceded right of the princes to reform abuses in religion—the *jus reformandi*. This system made the government of the Church, not including, however, the determination of doctrinal disputes, a part of the prince's proper function, as the ruler of the State. This theory was advanced by Thomasius, whose opinion was shared for substance by Grotius, and by Selden, the English defender of the theory which denies the autonomy of the Church, and is known under the name of Erastianism. Professed at first in the interest of toleration, the "territorial system" became the potent instrument of tyranny. Another theory, the "collegial system," was elaborated by Puffendorf and Pfaff. This made the Church originally an independent society, which devolved, by contract, episcopal authority upon the civil rulers. The oppression of the Church by the State—what the Germans call *Cæsaro-papismus*—has been a prolific source of evil in Lutheran communities.

In Zurich, Church and State were practically identified. Ecclesiastical authority was lodged in the hands of the great council, which governed the city. The clergy were nominated, or presented, by the magistrates, and accepted or rejected by the people convened for the purpose. Excommunication was, also, a function of the Christian magistracy. A Christian government, Zwingli held, may punish actions in contravention of the Word of God, although he had at first rejected the principle of coercion in matters of religion. Any other than a Christian government, he taught, may be overthrown by the people—peaceably, if possible ; if not possible, then by force. In 1525 a court made up of pastors and civilians was constituted for deciding questions pertaining to marriage and divorce. The Zurich system, in its essential features, was adopted at Berne and at Basel.

Calvin resisted the doctrine that the Church is to be absorbed in the State. He taught that the officers of the Church should be chosen by the congregation under the lead and concurrence of the officers already existing. The State has no right to intrude within the jurisdiction of the Church,

Church gov-
ernment in
Zurich.

Church gov-
ernment in
Geneva.

by putting over it officers or administering censures. Yet the State is bound to co-operate with the Church, and to give effect to its acts of discipline. Baneful heresies the magistrate is bound to extirpate; and offences against religion, such as blasphemies and idolatry of every sort, he is bound to punish. This idea of the relation of government to religion is substantially that which had been held in the Catholic Church. In the constitution of Geneva he bent, in some measure, to circumstances, and allowed to the councils more power in Church affairs than his main principle would warrant. The two classes of officers at Geneva were elders and deacons. He first established the eldership in full vigor, committing the regulation of doctrine and discipline to a body of clerical and lay pastors, there being twice as many laymen as ministers on the board.

The Presbyterian constitution, with some diversities of form, was adopted in the Protestant Churches of Scotland, France, and the Netherlands. In Scotland there were constituted two classes of elders—ruling, or lay elders, and preaching elders—who together formed the kirk session, the governing body in the local church. Vacancies in the lay part of the session were filled by the body itself, on the nomination of the pastor. The highest tribunal was the general assembly. In France the preacher, with the lay elders and deacons, formed the consistory or senate, the governing body in the local church. Vacancies were filled on the nomination of the consistory itself. The minister was nominated by the elders and deacons, and the nomination was ratified or rejected by the people; but if rejected, there might be an appeal to the provincial synod. The general synod was composed of an equal number of lay and clerical delegates. After 1572, between the consistories and provincial synods were the “colloquies,” made up of delegates from the consistories of a district, dealing with subjects of common interest, and having the power to censure church officers.

According to the Articles of the Church of England, it belongs to “men who have public authority given them in the congregation”—that is, in the body of the Church—“to call and send ministers into the Lord’s vineyard.” We have already learned what restrictions were placed on the hierarchical body. The presence of the bishops—who, however, were selected by the government—in the House of Lords, gave to the clergy a certain share in legislative action. Different theories have been propounded respecting the nature of the con-

Presbyterian-
ism in differ-
ent countries.

Theories as to
Church and
State in
England.

nection of Church and State in England. It was the theory of Hooker that the Church and State are one and the same society, which, as related to temporal concerns, and all things except true religion, is the commonwealth; as related to religion, is the Church. An earnest advocate of this hypothesis in recent times was Dr. Thomas Arnold, who finds in the king's supremacy an emblem and a realization of the truth that the laity have a right to govern in the Church. This identity of Church and State was denied by Warburton, who substitutes for it the theory of an alliance between two bodies in their nature distinct. This view of a distinction between Church and State, but of a combination of the two, in the English system, has been propounded by Coleridge in a peculiar form. The visible Church of Christ in England, he alleges, is to be distinguished from the national or established Church; yet the ministers of the first body are employed by the second, on fixed terms, for the promotion of the moral and religious culture of the people. But the connection is one that may be dissevered. Mr. Gladstone, in his early work on Church and State, espouses a view not essentially diverse from that of Coleridge. In Germany, the eminent theologian, Richard Rothe, has contended for a conception of the Christian State the same in its fundamental assumption as that held by Hooker and Arnold.

Among Protestants, in matters pertaining to worship, there were two opposite tendencies. There was a disposition, on the one hand, to break the connection with the mediæval church, and to fall back on the directions of Scripture or the customs of the Apostolic Age. This tendency, on the whole, prevailed in the Swiss churches and among the English Puritans. Elsewhere there was an inclination to retain, where it was admissible, existing usages, and to keep up a bond of union with the immediate past. This was the dominant feeling in England. The Articles give to the Church a certain latitude as regards the regulation of the ritual. The Church, it is said, may decree rites and ceremonies which are not repugnant to Holy Writ. "Every particular or national Church," moreover, is free, under the condition just stated, "to ordain, change, or abolish" these forms, provided the end kept in view is the edification of the flock. The Lutherans were actuated by the same spirit, and followed the same general principles. It is a grave mistake, however, to suppose that liturgical worship has any necessary association with episcopal government, or that the Reformed or Calvinistic

Worship
among Prot-
estants.

churches felt any objection to it. On the contrary, there were liturgies in all the Protestant churches in the age of the Reformation, and at the present day liturgies are in use in most of the Protestant churches of Europe. There were two things on which Protestants unanimously insisted. One was that worship should be in the people's tongue; the other was that the people should take part in it.

In 1523 and 1526, Luther prepared manuals of public worship which were founded on the old ritual, many of the ancient forms

Lutheran
forms of
worship.

being retained. Private confession before communion he neither rejected nor did he make it obligatory.

Exorcism in connection with the rite of baptism was retained by him, but was excluded from several of the Lutheran churches. Confirmation in a modified form was sometimes retained. At a much later time, regarded as a renewal of the baptismal vow, it was generally adopted in the Lutheran communities. It was not until 1543 that the custom of elevating the host in the Lord's Supper was dropped at Wittenberg. The altar was furnished with candles and the crucifix. By the Lutherans, music, both instrumental and vocal, was highly approved and cherished as a part of public worship. The organ was still used; and notwithstanding the importance attached to congregational singing, the choir remained, both for its own part in the service and to render aid in the musical training of the people. "All the arts," said Luther, "are not to be struck down by the Gospel." The churches were decorated with pictures, the subjects being scriptural. "If it is not a sin, but right," he said, "to have Christ's image in the heart, why should it be a sin to have it in the eyes?" At the same time, the reformer was emphatic in his cautions against formalism and all idea of merit as connected with the devotions of the Christian sanctuary. Worship is worse than in vain if it be not in spirit and in truth. He demanded, moreover, that in the public services of religion, preaching should have the most prominent place. We must be masters of ceremonies, not let them be masters of us—was his motto. It was far from his wish, he declared, that his service-books should be imposed upon worshippers. He wished to have them cast aside the moment they ceased to edify. The Wittenberg manuals were at the foundation of the ritual forms adopted in most of the Lutheran states. The "church year" was reformed, but not given up, by the Lutherans. The great festivals connected with the life and work of Jesus—the Advent, Christmas, with Circumcision and Epiphany, Easter, As-

cension, Whitsuntide, and the festival of Trinity—were retained, as were also the days commemorative of the Apostles, the day of John the Baptist, and the feasts of the Annunciation, Purification, and Visitation of the Virgin Mary. Even the day in honor of Michael the Archangel, and that of St. Lawrence, a martyr in the third century, were not abolished, although from these, as from all other sacred seasons, fables and superstitions were to be carefully purged away.

Zwingli did not propose to reject ceremonies, in case they were edifying, even if the Scriptures did not enjoin them. Yet the

Worship in
Zurich and
Basel.

changes in worship at Zurich were radical. A new order of service was introduced. The misuse of the organ

had produced a widespread opposition to the retention of that instrument in the churches, so that even in the Council of Trent there was a party in favor of banishing it. It was excluded at Zurich, the choir was abolished, and there was for a time no singing. This fact, considering Zwingli's personal delight in music, shows the bent of his mind as regards the nature of evangelical worship. At Basel the organ was restored in 1561. In the services at Zurich there was much exposition of Scripture, and in no Protestant town was there a more general zeal in the study of the Bible or greater familiarity with its contents.

At Geneva, Farel had abolished the liturgy altogether. A service-book, simple but sufficiently full, was composed by Calvin, in

Worship
at Geneva.

1536, for the Genevan Church. This was for use on the

Lord's day. On week-days the preachers had no prescribed forms of prayer. The psalms were sung in the French versions of Marot and Beza. In subsequent times, Calvin's liturgy at Geneva was very much reduced in compass. The Genevan liturgy served as a free model and guide for the construction of service-books in Calvinistic churches of other lands. Knox prepared a liturgy for the Church of Scotland.

The peculiar genius of the Protestant religion—the free and joyous spirit inspired by the doctrine of gratuitous forgiveness, and

Hymnology.

by the part which the laity assumed in worship, and in the management of Church affairs—was manifested in the

“outburst of poetry and music,” that was especially characteristic of Germany. Luther himself published thirty-six hymns, twenty-one of which were original. The rest were translations, or adaptations from earlier German songs. Music, owing not a little to his example and efforts, made a corresponding advance. He did not hesitate to appropriate to sacred uses secular melodies al-

ready familiar. Before his time, as far back as the minnesingers, but especially in the fifteenth century, numerous hymns had been written. A great part of them related to the Virgin Mary. The pressure to introduce the singing of hymns into the mass had been steadily resisted. But now the people were free to utter in unison the praises of God. Numerous hymn-writers arose, but Luther stands at the head of them all. His hymn,

“A mighty fortress is our God,”

has been called by Heine “the Marseillaise of the Reformation.” One of the most stirring of his lyrics was written after the burning of two Lutheran martyrs at Brussels, in 1523 :

“Flung to the heedless winds,
Or on the waters cast,
Their ashes shall be watched
And gathered at the last,” etc.

The hymns of Luther were sung not only in the church, but also in the household, the workshop, the market-place, and by armies on their march. The gospel was carried on the wings of song, and in this way spread abroad almost as much as by the voice of the preacher. Among other contemporary hymn-writers was Paul Eber, whose hymn, beginning,

“When, in the hour of utmost need,
We know not where to look for aid,”

was written in 1547, when the army of Charles V. was besieging Wittenberg. In the following century there is a roll of famous German hymn-writers, of whom Paul Gerhard (1606-1676) is, perhaps, the best. He wrote one hundred and twenty hymns. One of the best-known of them is that beginning,

“O Head, so full of bruises!
Brow, that its life-blood loses!”

In England, sacred poetry was written by the dramatists, and by other authors, such as Sidney and Donne, of the Elizabethan period ; and a little later, George Herbert (1593-1632) wrote his quaint poems, of which some are still sung in the churches. He is the author of the hymn on Sunday,

“O day most calm, most bright,
The fruit of this, the next world’s bud,” etc.,

and of the lines on Virtue, of which the first are,

“Sweet day! so cool, so calm, so bright,
The bridal of the earth and sky.”

But it was not until a subsequent period that anything like “a people’s hymn-book” arose in England.

CHAPTER X.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

Both the principal branches of the Protestant family, the Lutherans and the Reformed, united in the two fundamental principles of justification by faith alone, and of the exclusive authority of the Bible as the rule of faith and conduct. The Church of England, notwithstanding its deference to the fathers and the first centuries, was emphatic in the assertion of these doctrines. It accepts the ancient creeds on the express ground that they can be proved by “most certain warrants of Holy Scripture;” it declares that the Church of Rome, as well as the great patriarchates of the East, have erred in matters of faith, and it affirms the same of general councils. The Reformers heard the voice of Christ in the Scriptures. Their interpretation of the Bible verified itself to their hearts by the light and peace which the acceptance of it infused. The traditional belief in the authority of the Roman Church had to give way on account of the perceived contrariety of its doctrine to the plain utterances of Scripture on the method of salvation. The right of private judgment was implied in the procedure by which the teaching of Rome was rejected, and another meaning was attached to the language of the Bible. The original point of difference between the Lutherans and the Reformed pertained to the Lord’s Supper. Calvinism was likewise distinguished by the stress which it laid on the sovereignty of God in the bestowal of grace, and by its greater disinclination to rites not expressly sanctioned by Scripture. Next to Luther, Melancthon was the leading expounder of doctrine on the Lutheran side. His work, the “*Loci Communes*,” was the earliest of the Protestant treatises on dogmatic theology. The “*Augsburg Confession*,” and the “*Apology*” for it, both of which he wrote, continued to be authorities in the Lutheran

The Luther-
ans and the
Reformed.

Sources of
Lutheran
doctrine.

churches. But Melanchthon's departure from Luther on the question of the Lord's Supper, and on the part taken by the human will in conversion, awakened intense hostility on the side of the strict Lutherans. These, the "Anti-Philippists," embodied their

1577. dissent from the peculiarities of Melanchthon in the creed called the "Form of Concord." The "Smalcald

Articles," drawn up by Luther in 1536, and his catechisms, have an honored place among the Lutheran symbols. The Lutheran Church was agitated from time to time by other debates. Such were the Antinomian controversy, occasioned by the doctrine of John Agricola, that repentance must be produced by the preaching not of the law, but of the gospel; the Osiandrian controversy, occasioned by the belief of Osiander, that the righteousness of the divine nature of Jesus is actually communicated to the soul in the reception of him by faith; the Adiaphoristic controversy, between Lutherans and Philippists, on the question whether rites, if prescribed by the State, and not in themselves wrong, may be adopted by the Church—a debate similar to the contention between Puritans and Churchmen in England; the Flacian controversy, provoked by the teaching of Matthias Flacius, an Anti-Philippist, to

d. 1575. the effect that original sin has corrupted the very substance of the soul—an extravagance of opinion which the Lutherans generally repudiated. In the list of Lutheran theologians, Chemnitz, the most learned follower of Melanchthon, and, in the seventeenth century, Quenstedt, stand in the first rank.

None of the sects which sprang up in the wake of the Reformation produced so great a ferment as the Anabaptists. The name,

The Anabaptists: the Baptists.

which signifies re-baptizers, was affixed to them by their adversaries for the reason that they rejected infant baptism and baptized anew all of their number who had received the sacrament in infancy. The Anabaptists were the radicals of the Reformation. They considered that the Reformers had left their work half done. Their rise is owing partly, but not wholly, to the Protestant revolt against Rome. But, as Dorner has observed, "all the different anti-ecclesiastical tendencies which . . . had secretly pervaded the life of the people in the middle ages got vent after the reform excitement issued from Wittenberg, and obtained a wider extension under the new movement." There had been opposition to infant baptism in earlier days among the Waldenses and other sects, as well as from individuals like Peter of Bruges, and Henry of Clugny. But this one tenet was not the sole characteristic of the Anabaptists in which we find the continu-

ance or reproduction of former ideas and tendencies. The Church, they insisted, must be composed exclusively of the regenerate, and religion is not a matter to be regulated and managed by civil rulers. Under the name of Anabaptists are included different types of doctrine and of Christian life. It is a gross injustice to impute to all of them the wild and destructive fanaticism with which a portion of them are chargeable. This fanatical class are first heard of in Germany, under Thomas Münzer, as a leader, who appeared in the character of a prophet at Zwickau in 1521, and in the Peasants' War in 1525 sought to establish his revolutionary doctrines. These involved the abolition of all existing authorities in Church and State, and the substitution of a kingdom of the saints, in which he was to be the chief. He, with other leaders, was put to death on the suppression of the rebellion. Very different from the disciples of Münzer, however, were Grebel and other Anabaptists who organized themselves at Zurich. They rejected the government of the Church by the city, and refused to acknowledge infant baptism. They were enthusiasts, but not fanatics. They were peaceful in their spirit, and, as it would appear, were sincerely devout. These traits, however, did not protect them from harsh and unwarrantable punishment as disturbers of public order and advocates of pestilent error. Some of them were put to death. It was believed that they aimed at the overthrow of the magistracy. They went no farther, however, than to maintain that no Christian could be a magistrate, or take part in the infliction of capital punishment. But Grebel, if he did not himself approve of rebellion, yet, by preaching among the peasants in a district where they rose in armed revolt, exposed himself to the charge of sympathizing with their seditious schemes. Itinerant missionaries diffused Anabaptist opinions of the pacific type far and wide in South Germany. A second violent attempt to found a theocracy on the ruins of the existing order was made at Münster, where the fanatical leaders exercised extreme tyranny and license, until the town was taken, and they, after suffering cruel tortures, were put to death. In the third and fourth decades of the sixteenth century, "Anabaptism spread like a burning fever through all Germany; from Swabia and Switzerland, along the Rhine to Holland and Friesland, from Bavaria, Middle Germany, Westphalia, and Saxony, as far as Holstein." In the Netherlands, in the time of Charles V., Anabaptists were guilty of offences against decency and morality, which were repaid with savage penalties. Afterwards, we find that a numerous body who were stigmatized by the

same name, but were of a totally different spirit, were organized under the guidance of Menno Simonis, a religious and conscientious man. These aimed to live strictly according to the gospel. There were fraternities of the same sect in fellowship with them in Germany. The Mennonites did not set up formal creeds, they discarded oaths, the use of weapons, and every sort of revenge, and, while they approved of civil government, declined themselves to hold office in the state. They had strict discipline in their churches; but on this subject there was an extremely rigorous and a more lenient party. English Brownists, or Independents, who came over to Holland, were brought into connection with the Mennonites. There was a bond of sympathy in their common opposition to national churches and in the demand that regeneration should precede Church membership. After 1535 many Anabaptists crossed over to England and formed congregations at Norwich and other places. They were reinforced by certain Brownists who had espoused Anabaptist opinions in Holland. In 1605, Rev. John Smyth, who had been vicar of Gainsborough, and a company with him, separated from the Independent Church at Amsterdam. Smyth, not acknowledging the baptism which he had received in infancy, baptised himself, and hence was called the "se-baptist." The church formed by him was divided. A part of them, first under the pastoral care of Helwys, and then of Murton, crossed to England in 1611, and a few years afterwards (1612-1614) formed a Baptist church in London. In Switzerland, Grebel and his associates are thought to have adopted, after a time, the practice of immersion. Whether Smyth baptized himself in this manner, and when among English Baptists immersion began to be the form of the rite—whether in 1641, as many believe, or before that date—are still subjects of dispute.

Among the mystics who were not satisfied with the Lutheran tenets, were the followers of Caspar Schwenckfeld, a pious nobleman who, in 1525, conceived himself to have been enlightened from above as to the real meaning of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, about which there was so much contention. His view was more nearly that of the Zwinglians. But his peculiarities went much further. Forensic justification, he taught, was of no account without the renewal of the soul by Christ, the internal Word. Not discarding the Scriptures and the sacraments, he gave them a subordinate place. His principal point related to the Incarnation. Here he held that the human nature of Christ, though truly human, is the offspring of God, as well as of

The
Schwenck-
feldians.

the Virgin, and hence differs from the nature of men generally. It is exalted to be literally a partaker of the divine nature. It is the glorified Christ dwelling within us, who is the source of true righteousness, and of a life which includes a participation in the divine perfections. Schwenckfeld had many disciples in Silesia and other districts. Persecuted in Germany, a great part of them, in 1734, emigrated to Pennsylvania.

A sect of less importance was the Family of Love, or the Familists. David George, or Joris, a native of Delft, who spent his closing years in Basel, and died in 1556, claimed to be the second David, through whom the prophecies were to reach a complete fulfilment. A kindred spirit, Henry Niclas, or Nicholas, the real founder of the Familists, in 1533 took up his abode in West Friesland. An escape from all legalism, and spiritual perfection, were the ideal of this sect. They made a stir in England in the reign of Elizabeth. Some of them are allowed to have been pure and devout. Others were accused of lax, licentious practices, the result of a mystical antinomianism.

The symbols in the Reformed branch of the Protestant body are much more numerous than in the Lutheran, for the reason that the Reformed Churches were established in so many different communities. We have the creeds—as the two Basel Confessions—which grew up in the days of Zwingli. After Calvin acquired influence, and the Swiss theology spread, the confessions multiplied. Among them is the Heidelberg Catechism, which was composed in the Palatinate, where Melancthon's theology prevailed, and where the elector, Frederic III., left the Lutherans and joined the Reformed. This Catechism, and the later Helvetic Confession, are the symbols of the German Reformed Church, which came into being in the way referred to. Other well-known Calvinistic creeds are the Gallic, the creed of the Huguenots; the Belgic Confession and the Decrees of the Synod of Dort, the symbols of Dutch Calvinism; the Scottish Confession, written by Knox; the Westminster Confession and the Catechisms, framed by the English Presbyterians; the Savoy Confession, which was adopted by the English Independents. On the list of influential theologians, besides the illustrious names of Zwingli and Calvin, with contemporaries of high repute, such as Œcolampadius, Bucer, and Bullinger, there is a large body of Calvinistic teachers on the continent, belonging to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, men of ability and learning, whose names and writings have ceased to be familiar to any save students of his-

The Family.
lists.

Reformed
symbols and
theologians.

torical theology. By them Calvinism was defined and defended with logical precision, but in a style too dry and scholastic to suit the taste of after-times.

The German Reformed Church, owing to the circumstances of its origin, was comparatively mild in its formulas of predestination.

Within the limits of this school, but having its principal seat in Holland, the Federal theology arose. This grouped the Calvinistic doctrines under the scheme of the Covenants—the Covenant of Redemption between the persons of the Trinity, the Covenant of Works with Adam, and the Covenant of Grace. By the introduction of these jural relations, the aspect of the system, which had made everything to rest on the divine de-

crees, was softened. Cocceius, one of the leading ex-
 1603-1669. pounders of the Federal theology, brought into vogue the typical method of interpreting the Old Testament. An opposing party, which clung to the older form of Calvinism, based on the naked decrees, was led by Boetius. One of the learned ex-
 pounders of the Federal system was Witsius (1636-1708). It gained favor and spread rapidly, not only in Holland but in Great Britain, and elsewhere among Calvinists, taking the place of the hard, scholastic form of Calvinistic teaching.

In the French school of Saumur, one of the Huguenot theological academies, there appeared deviations from the current
 The school of Saumur. statements of Calvinism. John Cameron, a Scotchman

of remarkable talents, was the first to propose innovations. His pupil, Amyraut (1596-1664), taught the doctrine of “hypothetic universal grace,” as it was called, which was really an approach to the idea of universal atonement. He was more than once charged with heresy before the national Synod of the French Church, but was each time acquitted. One of his colleagues La-

place (Placeus), raised a storm by teaching that Adam’s sin is not immediately imputed to his posterity, but that the native depravity of men is the first ground of their condemnation. A third professor, Cappel, startled the strict Calvinists by the statement that the vowel pointing of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is an
 1675. invention later than the Christian era, and has no divine authority, and that the accepted or masoretic text of the ancient Scriptures is open to amendment. Against these opinions of the Saumur faculty, the “Formula Consensus Helvetica,” the last of the creeds framed by the Swiss theologians, is levelled.

Such modifications of Calvinism were of small moment when compared with the rise of the great Arminian revolt. James Ar-

minius was an able, accomplished man, who had sojourned in Italy and had counted among his teachers Beza, the friend and pupil of Calvin. He was a native of Holland, and was made professor of theology at Leyden in 1603. Previously, while a preacher at Amsterdam, and engaged in preparing a refutation of attacks on the supralapsarian doctrine of decrees, he fell into doubt on the whole subject, which resulted in his rejecting the doctrine of unconditional election altogether. Opposed to him at Leyden was Gomarus, a high Calvinist. The followers of Arminius multiplied, and the contest of the two parties spread through Holland. It was a debate on the essential points of Calvinism. The successor of Arminius was Episcopius, a theologian of distinguished ability. In the organization of the Arminians, Uytenbogaert was chiefly influential. Their creed was set forth

in the Remonstrance, addressed by them to the Estates of Holland and West Friesland, which gave to them the name of "Remonstrants," by which they were commonly known in Holland. In this document they affirm conditional election on the ground of foreseen faith, universal atonement, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, whose influences, however, are not irresistible, and the doubtfulness of the doctrine of the universal perseverance of converted souls. A great political line of division separated the two contending parties. The Arminians were republicans. The Calvinists adhered to Maurice, Prince of Orange. The

The Synod of
Dort.

Synod of Dort was intended to be a sort of general council of Calvinistic churches to sit in judgment on the Arminian theology. In it representatives from several countries were actually present. Several delegates were sent from England by King James I. The synod abstained from sanctioning the extreme dogma of Gomarus, but it condemned the characteristic tenets of the Arminians. It asserted unconditional election, limited atonement, irresistible grace, perseverance of all the regenerate. After this time, the Arminians for a period were forbidden to exercise their religion. Two hundred of their preachers were deposed. When Prince Henry became stadtholder, they first obtained tolera-

tion, and then full liberty to build churches and schools.

Among the lights of the Arminian body were Hugo Grotius, equally renowned as a scholar, diplomatist, and theologian, who composed a very important treatise on the atonement, and commentaries on the Scriptures; Limborch, who is, perhaps, the best expositor of the Arminian doctrinal system; Le Clerc and Wettstein, critical and exegetical students of exceptional acute-

ness and erudition. The Arminians did the work of pioneers in the critical study of the Bible and of the early history of the Church. They were averse to strict doctrinal tests, and naturally advocates of toleration. They were inclined to reduce to a minimum the requirements for Christian union. Thus there were found among them varying shades of opinion. Many joined them who went much further than Arminius in the denial of received doctrines. Socinians, when driven from Poland, made their way to Holland, where they became amalgamated with the party which opened hospitable doors to dissenters from the Calvinistic creed. In England, in the Caroline period, Arminianism grew to be the prevalent faith in the English Episcopal Church. It leavened with its scholarly but tepid spirit the English theology of the eighteenth century. In the Methodist revival it acquired a peculiar life and fervency which had never belonged to it either in its native home or after it was transplanted to Great Britain.

For the origin of Socinianism we must turn to Italy. The writings of Michael Servetus no doubt had a decided influence in dif-

fusing anti-trinitarian opinions; but most of the conspicuous Unitarians who first appear were of Italian birth. In that country, as a concomitant of the renaissance culture, rationalistic beliefs were widely diffused in the cultivated class. It was Faustus Socinus, born of a noble family

1539-1604.

in Sienna, who gave his own name to the adherents of Unitarianism. He first studied law and then theology. He inherited the papers of his uncle, Lælius Socinus, who was a man of an inquiring mind, and indicated in his intercourse with Calvin and other Protestant leaders whom he visited, a sympathy with Unitarian doctrine. After a long residence in Florence, and a sojourn of three years in Basel, Faustus went to Poland, where he passed the remainder of his life. There he found Unitarians who had preceded him. He persuaded them to resume the custom of infant baptism, which they had discarded, and was accepted by them as a guide and teacher. By Socinus and by the scholars who were trained in the Polish schools, Unitarianism was defined and ably defended. It spread among the higher classes until its adherents were persecuted in the period of the Catholic reaction. Socinus examined the Bible as a text-book of Christian doctrine, not so much to meet any deep spiritual want within him, or to appease an inward moral struggle, but in the peculiar rationalistic temper that grew out of his studies and associations. His system was set forth in the Racovian Catechism (composed by the Racow preachers),

and in the works of the *Fratres Poloni*—Socinus himself, Crellius, Schlichtingius, etc. The central point of their creed

1605. was the denial of the divinity and satisfaction of Christ. His office was made to be that of a teacher and legislator. He reveals the immortality of the soul and verifies his testimony on this subject by rising from the dead. It is worthy of note that among the proofs of Christianity, miracles had the first, if not an exclusive, place. The rationalistic tendency led here to an extreme supernaturalism, in which the force of the internal evidence of the gospel counted for little. The ordinary doctrines of original sin and of native depravity were rejected. It was held that Satan and the incorrigibly wicked are at last annihilated.

The special character of the English Reformation and the questions in dispute between Churchmen and Puritans have already been described. In the sixteenth century the leaders

Anglican theologians. who were chiefly concerned in building up Protestantism—as Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, Hooper, Jewel—were prominent preachers and theological authors. The fame of Richard Hooker rests mainly on his “*Ecclesiastical Polity* ;” but his fragmentary essays on the sacraments and on predestination are, in point of ability, on the level of that more elaborate treatise. In the seventeenth century, there is a long catalogue of eminent theologians and divines, both in the Established Church and in the ranks of the Puritans. Several of the names which it is convenient to group together here, carry us beyond the chronological limit of the present period. In patristic lore, Archbishop Ussher had no superior. His candor and piety were equal to his learning.

1581-1655. He was an Episcopalian of the most moderate school.

From him, it may be remarked, was derived the chronology connected with the authorized version of the Bible. To Bishop Bull, the erudite champion of the orthodox doctrine of the

1634-1710. Trinity, reference will hereafter be made. In exuberance of fancy, Jeremy Taylor, “the Shakespere of

1613-1667. preachers,” excels all other contemporary divines. His “*Holy Living and Dying*” has remained a classic in English devotional literature. His “*Ductor Dubitantium*”—“*Guide of Doubters*”—is one of a considerable number of copious treatises on casuistry which were produced in that age. To the Puritan theologians it was a theme of special interest. At one time, at Oxford, when the Puritans were in the ascendant, there was an office where ministers might be consulted in cases of conscience. Taylor, like so many other divines in that period of theological study and strife,

was a very voluminous author. Isaac Barrow, besides being a preacher whose vigorous style has won the highest praise from the best judges of literary merit, was a mathematician of extraordinary ability. He has the distinction of having been the teacher of Sir Isaac Newton. Edward Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, evinced his metaphysical acumen in a controversy with Locke, and his skill as a theologian in books on the evidences of Christianity, on the Atonement, and on the Trinity. In his theory of Episcopacy he was a very moderate Churchman. Sherlock will come under our notice as an antagonist of Deism and a writer on the doctrine of the Trinity. Waterland ranks next to Bull as the defender of this article of faith. John Pearson, Bishop of Chester, published an "Exposition of the [Apostles'] Creed," which deserves the high esteem that it has always enjoyed as a manual of theology in the English Church. His discussion of the Trinity in this treatise is learned and instructive. Bishop Burnet is famous for his "History of the Reformation," and for other productions, of which one is the "Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles." On the publication of the first volume of his history, he received the thanks of both houses of Parliament, with a request to continue the work. In early life, he spent some time in Holland, where a perception of the unfeigned piety to be found in a number of different religious bodies, inspired him with a catholic spirit. His claims to respect as a man and as a historian have been vindicated by Macaulay, in the second volume of his "History of England." Robert Leighton, Archbishop of Glasgow, was an Episcopal prelate whose writings, especially his "Commentary on the First Epistle of Peter," are marked by spiritual insight and charity. The sermons of Robert South are distinguished for their vigor of thought, and still more for their racy style. His sentences follow one another like the blows of a flail. In respect to force of expression few preachers have ever surpassed him. The vituperative rhetoric which he delighted to pour out on the heads of the Puritans, in the days of Charles II., gave keen delight to his auditors. South was a thinker of no mean ability, and a Calvinist in his theology. His discourse on "Man in the Image of God," is one of the best of the better class of his pulpit productions. In wide contrast with South as regards temper, as well as in the character of their studies, were three divines justly honored for their scholarly attainments: John Lightfoot, a learned He-

1630-1677.

1635-1699.

William Sherlock, 1641-1707.

1683-1740.

1612-1686.

1643-1715.

1611-1684.

1623-1716.

braist, who sat in the Westminster Assembly and wrote the "Horæ
 1648-1724. Hebraicæ;" Humphrey Prideaux, the author of "The
 1668-1723. Connection between the Old and the New Testaments,"
 an historical work excellent for its time; and Joseph
 Bingham, whose untiring researches bore their fruit in his "An-
 tiquities of the Christian Church."

In the numerous company of Puritan divines and authors, a few
 may be singled out for particular notice. Richard Baxter (1615-
 Puritan di- 1691) was too poor to study at a university, but he
 vinea. amassed an immense store of learning. Of the one hun-
 dred and sixty eight books that he wrote, three of which are large
 folios, the two that are best known are the "Saints' Everlasting
 Rest," and the "Call to the Unconverted." In them his religious
 earnestness impresses every reader. Compared with his copious
 theological treatises, they cost him little labor. Baxter was a
 Presbyterian, was for a time chaplain in Cromwell's army, but by
 no means a cordial supporter of his government. In politics as
 in theology, it was his lot to take a middle course, and, although
 perfectly upright and disinterested, to receive the blows of the
 contending parties. He was willing to submit to episcopacy, but
 preferred a larger number of bishops and a division of the bishop's
 power with a council of presbyters. He aimed to mediate between
 the Arminians and Calvinists, for he was a sincere lover of peace.
 He thought that strife in theology was principally caused by the
 ambiguity of terms. His own type of belief may be described as
 moderate Calvinism. He held that sufficient grace is given to all
 to repent, but that the grace of the Spirit is not given indiscrim-
 inately or in equal measure to all. Where it is granted in larger
 measure, it is partly on account of a greater receptivity, and partly
 for good reasons inscrutable to us. Burnet says of Baxter: "He
 had a very moving and pathetical way of writing, and was his whole
 life long a man of great zeal and much simplicity, but was most
 unhappily subtle and metaphysical in everything." His preaching
 was in the highest degree stirring and persuasive. He was sent to
 prison by the notorious Jeffreys, under James II., but was liberated,
 and survived the Revolution of 1688. At Kidderminster, where his
 continued labors as a pastor were signally successful, a statue in
 honor of him was unveiled in 1875, bearing the inscription: "Be-
 tween the years 1641 and 1660, this town was the scene of the labors
 of Richard Baxter, renowned equally for his Christian learning and
 his pastoral fidelity. In a stormy and divided age he advocated
 unity and comprehension, pointing the way to everlasting rest."

John Owen was the leader of the Independents. His "Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews," his treatises on "Divine Justice" and on "Justification," and his polemical writings against Arminians and Socinians, are monuments of his erudition. Owen was a rigid Calvinist. He was sometimes opposed to Baxter, and measured swords with him in a controversy on the atonement. He also wrote controversially against John Goodwin (1593-1665) a learned independent, but an Arminian, and an advocate of universal atonement. Goodwin held that the heathen in whom are seeds of piety and of faith in redeeming mercy, are saved,—a doctrine at that time obnoxious to Calvinists. He is not to be confounded with Thomas Goodwin, also an Independent of high distinction, and a Calvinist. John Howe, the author of "The Living Temple," a discussion of the foundations of theism, and of other learned theological writings, was one of the most genial and attractive of the great Puritan divines. He was at one time a chaplain of Cromwell, but he was held in esteem by all parties. Robert Hall said of him: "I have learned more from John Howe than from any author I ever read." The Puritan divines wrote out of full minds, and with hearts on fire with Christian zeal. Hence they were prolix, and suffer the penalty of neglect, which generally overtakes this fault.

There were two laymen in the Puritan party who are conspicuous for their talents and fame as authors. John Selden was a lawyer. He was, also, an historian and a theologian, with attainments as profound as they were varied. The "Hebrew Wife" is a treatise from his pen on the subject of marriage and divorce in the Jewish state. His "Table-Talk" is full of nuggets of gold. Selden sat in the Westminster Assembly. He was styled by Grotius "the glory of the British nation." The distinction of John Milton as a poet has not availed to eclipse his merit as a prose writer of unsurpassed eloquence. The splendor of his diction is suited to the elevation and glow of feeling that inspired him. He was Latin Secretary of Cromwell, and was an Independent, hardly less averse to Presbyterianism than to Episcopacy. It had been found, he said, that "new presbyter is but old priest writ large." He mingled in the controversy with prelacy, in opposition to Bishop Hall and Ussher. His posthumous treatise on "Christian Doctrine" was brought to light in 1823, and was published two years afterwards. This treatise, although he began early to collect materials for such a work, was written in his later years. In middle life he was Calvin-

Owen, 1616-
1683.

Howe, 1630-
1705.

Selden, 1564-
1654.

Milton, 1608-
1674.

istic in belief. In the book just named, he distinctly advocates Arian and Arminian opinions. He propounds the same lax view of divorce that is presented in writings which were published in his lifetime. He denies that the observance of the Lord's Day is binding on account of the fourth commandment, or of any other scriptural law. He holds that immersion is the proper form of baptism, that there is no Scriptural warrant for the baptism of infants, but that if one has been baptized in infancy, he need not be baptized again—even as the baptism of John was regarded as sufficient for the disciples of Jesus.

In the latter half of the sixteenth century, the Church of Rome made great exertions to define and to defend its position against

Protestantism. The creed of the Council of Trent left room for dissonant opinions on the relation of free-will to grace, but furnished statements of doctrine that were in general sufficiently clear. The Roman Catechism, framed by a commission of theologians, was more favorable to the papal interest than the Tridentine symbol. The Jesuits did not like its Do-

minican theology, and often preferred to use their own Catechism, written by Canisius. In the period of the Reformation, Erasmus was the foremost writer in behalf of the Roman Church, although there were notable polemics, like John Eck. Cajetan, a cardinal, the same who met Luther at Augsburg, became a thorough student of the Scriptures, and in his commentaries did not hesitate to differ in the interpretation of passages from the Fathers and Schoolmen. In the Tridentine age, as an indirect answer to the "Magdeburg Centuries," the work of Lu-

theran writers, Baronius wrote his long and learned "Ecclesiastical Annals," in the preparation of which he had access to the Vatican archives. The principal authority in dogmatic theology was the work of Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621), which furnished an arsenal of weapons for the defenders of the Catholic faith. He set forth an exalted view of the prerogatives of

the pope in relation to secular rulers. Father Paul Sarpi, in his "History of the Council of Trent," was so liberal in his ideas of clerical and papal authority, and so caustic in his criticism of persons and proceedings in the Church, that he was treated with more hostility than favor in his own communion. An attempt was even made to assassinate him. He was excommunicated, but was released from the ban when

Venice, his native city, whose cause he steadily maintained, made peace with the pope. To counteract the work of Father

Roman Cath-
olic creeds
and theo-
logians.

1554.

1538-1607.

1552-1623.

1607.

Paul, which gave so much pleasure to Protestants, Pallavicini wrote, from the papal point of view, another and a quite elaborate "History of the Council." Francis Suarez, a Spanish theologian of the Jesuit order, expounded with rare subtlety the scholastic theology of the Semi-Pelagian type. He taught the ethical principles of the order to which he belonged. His work against the heresies of the Anglican Church called out the special thanks of Pope Paul V., and was burned before St. Paul's Church by order of James I., and, also, in Paris by vote of parliament, which condemned it for its anti-Gallican assertions of papal supremacy. Suarez, with Bellarmine, affirmed the right of the pope to depose kings. The modern science of the history of theological doctrine owes a large debt to

1583-1652. Petavius, an erudite Jesuit, who was one of its principal

founders. His volumes on this subject are characterized by vast learning and by no small degree of literary skill. He grasped distinctly the idea of a development of doctrine. In this work and in other productions of his pen, it is manifest that he had profited by his friendship with eminent Protestant scholars, one of whom was Isaac Casaubon. The mystical and devout

1567-1622. school in the Roman Catholic Church had an influential

leader in Francis of Sales. In the neighborhood of Geneva he was active and successful in converting Protestants. In 1602 he was made Bishop of that city. He was a simple, pointed, impressive preacher. By devout women, of a type of piety akin to his own, he was highly valued as a religious guide. As an ecclesiastic and politician, he showed himself an adroit manager. His writings and example engendered in part the Quietism of which Molinos, Fénelon, and Madame Guyon were the representatives. Within the limits of this period falls the life

1585-1638. of Jansenius, Bishop of Ypres, by whom the Augustinian

theology was revived, and whose opinions were afterwards adopted by Pascal and the Port Royalists. Thus the Jansenist party, so influential in the history of France, had its origin.

The philosophy of Aristotle was so interwoven with the scholastic theology that in the assault upon it he was also an object of at-

1585-1638. tack. Luther calls him hard names, and often inveighs against him with full as much vigor as against Aquinas.

It was the Aristotelian ethics that was especially obnoxious to the Saxon reformer. His treatises in other branches of science Luther admitted to be useful. On the basis of them Melancthon prepared several manuals of instruction. The two renovators of philosophy are Bacon and Des Cartes. Bacon blamed the school-

men for their neglect of natural and physical science, and for the sterility of their method in its application to this class of inquiries. They had forgotten to search for physical causes, and had despised the path of patient investigation. But Bacon insisted that final causes "are worthy to be inquired, being kept within their own provinces" of metaphysics and theology. He would "rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind." If the mind looks on second causes, "confederate and linked together, it must needs fly to Providence and Deity." The discoveries of Copernicus subjected those who embraced them, if they were under the jurisdiction of the Church of Rome, to the penalties of heresy. Giordano Bruno, a man of brilliant intellect, an adherent of the Copernican theory, and an assailant of Aristotle, developed a theory of Pantheism, and was burned at the stake, at Rome, in 1600. Galileo was compelled by the Inquisition to renounce his opinions.

In metaphysics the founder of the modern schools was Des Cartes. He used all caution to avoid giving offence to ecclesiastics, but he did not escape the censure of the Sorbonne. Instead of beginning with a mass of statements taken for granted, philosophy claimed its independence. It was no longer to be the handmaid of theology. Des Cartes proposed to start with a self-evident proposition: "I think, therefore I am," and on this foundation to erect, by the aid of logic, the entire metaphysical structure. The doctrine of the separateness of mind and matter, of the immateriality of the soul, and of innate ideas, constituted the spiritual character of his system. Its publication was the advent of a new era.

The founder of modern Pantheism was Spinoza. He was of Jewish parentage and of Portuguese descent, but was born at Amsterdam. He was expelled from the synagogue for heresy. He was inspired with a deep but quiet passion for thought and study. A man of integrity, he declined from conscientious motives, a professorship at Heidelberg, preferring to support himself by manual labor. Spinoza held that there is one and but one substance, of which all things are the phenomenal manifestation. It has an infinite number of infinite attributes, only two of which, thought and extension, are revealed to us. All individual things, material and mental, are modes of the attributes; they have no substantial being. Self-consciousness and forethought are denied to the Deity, and our belief in free-will is called an illusion.

Francis Bacon, 1561-1626.

Des Cartes, 1596-1650.

Spinoza, 1632-1677.

The world is thus identified with God, and resolved into an expression of his infinite but impersonal nature. In his "Tractatus Theologico-Politicus," Spinoza entered into an examination of the Scriptures, and was the precursor of the rationalistic critics of Germany. Religion he affirmed to be the love of God, and to be independent of doctrines. The state may regulate the externals of religion, but must leave thought free.

There were writers in this period whose place is among the men of letters, but whom the history of philosophy cannot pass by.

François
Rabelais,
1483-1553.

Michel de
Montaigne,
1533-1592.

One of these was Rabelais, a child of the Renaissance, a humorist whose creed was confined to bare theism, without so much as a clear acknowledgment of the immortality of the soul. Montaigne, by his essays, founded a new department of literature, although the essays of Plutarch furnished a sort of model; and of Plutarch he was an ad-

mirating student. In Montaigne's genial and desultory dissertations on a great variety of topics, there is no hostility to Christian truth, but there is a depreciation of the capacity of reason, and such a remanding of religion to the domain of unsupported faith, as amounts to an amiable scepticism.

Protestants, in opposing the Roman Catholic belief that the tradition of apostolic teaching is on a level with Scripture, sometimes undervalued or ignored tradition as a form of historical evidence, and tacitly put traditions at a point near the apostolic age on a par with those of a later date.

A more discriminating statement on this subject was made by Arminius and Grotius. The Council of Trent gave normal authority to the Old Testament Apocrypha. Here the Protestants differed. The Apocryphal books were printed in connection with the early Protestant versions. These books, say the Thirty-nine Articles, "the

Church doth read for example of life and instruction of manners, but yet it doth not apply them to establish any doctrine." The Tridentine Council, strange to say, pronounced the Vulgate translation authoritative in controversies, an ordinance that has occasioned embarrassment to Roman Catholic scholars.

Respecting the canon, there was at the outset considerable freedom of expression among Protestant leaders. Luther placed Hebrews, James, Jude, and the Apocalypse at the end of his translation. He distinguishes them from "the Capital Books of the New Testament" which precede, as having "had of yore a different standing." He admires the Epistle of James,

The Bible
and Tradition.

Art. VI.

The Canon:
Inspiration.

yet thinks that James did not write it. He says of it that, compared with the writings of John, Paul, and Peter, "it is an epistle of straw." In the "Table-talk" he is reported as saying, "What matter if Moses did not write Genesis?" Both Luther and Zwingli discarded the Apocalypse as non-apostolic, and even Calvin takes no notice of it. Luther was inclined to weigh the value of each of the sacred books by the relation of its teaching to the doctrine of gratuitous salvation through Christ. This "article of a standing or falling Church" was the criterion of the genuineness or worth of a writing professing to be apostolic. There was little discussion of the doctrine of inspiration. It was not one of the points of dispute with the Catholics. Luther holds that there are historical discrepancies in the Scriptures. Even Calvin speaks of apparent dissonances on minor points as of no account. The Arminians and Socinians propounded more lax views of the nature and extent of inspiration than were prevalent. The Swiss theologians who framed the "Formula Consensus Helvetica" went to the opposite extreme. They claimed inspiration for the vowel-points of the Hebrew text, at least as to their potentiality. They were champions of the method of philology inculcated by Buxtorf, a distinguished grammarian. Among English theologians, Baxter differs somewhat from the customary views. He compares the Bible to a man's body, some parts of which have a higher dignity and esteem than others. He blames those who make the Christian religion stand or fall on the truth of "every item of history, genealogy, number, or word." "The sense," he declares, "is the soul of Scripture, and the letters but the body or vehicle." Protestants generally, as the contest with the Roman Catholics went on, were disposed to plant themselves on fixed views of the canon, and on the doctrine of biblical infallibility. On this subject the tone of the seventeenth-century theologians differs widely from that of Luther and his contemporaries.

As one guide in interpretation, the Protestants adopted the "analogy of faith." That is to say, assuming that the Scriptures are in harmony as regards doctrine, they made it a rule to interpret a passage of doubtful import in accordance with the meaning of other passages which are clear. Allegorical exegesis was for a considerable period prevalent. The tendency was to find, whenever it was possible, in the Old Testament, prophetic anticipations of the Messiah. Grotius went to the other extreme. It was said that Cocceius found Christ everywhere in the Old Testament; Grotius, nowhere. The Arminian scholars

did much to liberate exegesis from its servitude to dogmatic theology.

The Reformers taught that while the natural understanding is competent to judge of the external evidence of Revelation—to perceive, for example, the force of the argument from miracles—yet, for a spiritual discernment of the contents of Scripture, and for an inward, living perception and conviction of the reality of the gospel there unfolded, the testimony of the Holy Ghost, imparted directly to the heart, is requisite. Luther in severe and extravagant terms assails the pretensions of reason to judge in the sphere of divine truth; but his assault is really directed against reason as darkened by sin and swayed by an unwarrantable bias. Yet possibly a reminiscence of Occam's teaching on the contradictions of faith and science may have had its influence. The Socinians, who acknowledged no such blinding influence of moral evil, magnified the capacity of reason in its relation to religious inquiry. They not only insisted that nothing contrary to reason could be accepted; they were prone to attribute to a false interpretation Scripture doctrines, like the Trinity, which seemed to their minds inconsistent with reason. It was not the intention of the Protestants to exalt the creeds which they framed, above the Bible. In some of them the possibility of further light is expressly anticipated. In the contests of parties, however, as well as in the constant battle with Rome, there was a tendency, especially in the seventeenth century, to give to the accredited symbols a sort of authority not consistent with Protestant freedom, and the professed right of free inquiry and private judgment.

The Reformers, including Melancthon and Calvin, teach that some obscure knowledge of God and a latent conviction of responsibility to him are native to the mind. Des Cartes, among the philosophers, renewed the attempt to demonstrate the existence of the Deity. We have, he said, an innate idea of an infinite and perfect being; if there be not such a being, this idea is false and delusive. Des Cartes has another *a priori* argument. We have an idea of an all-perfect being, which includes in it the element of necessary existence, just as the equality of the three angles in a triangle to two right angles is involved necessarily in its idea. Philosophers still differ on the question of the validity of these arguments.

Calvin presents a perspicuous statement of the doctrine of the Trinity. Of such words as "person," as they occur in the formu-

Scripture and reason.

The being of God.

laries, Calvin says: "I could wish them, indeed, to be buried in oblivion, provided this faith were universally received, that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are the one God, and that, nevertheless, the Son is not the Father, nor the Spirit the Son, but that they are distinguished from each other by some peculiar property." Melancthon, while he was confident that divine honors ought to be rendered to Christ, confesses his perplexity in regard to defining the hypostases. Like Baxter and others, and after the example of Augustine, he sought for analogies to the Trinity in the constitution of the human mind.

The Lutherans and Calvinists made the divine image in Adam to consist in his perfections, natural and moral, collectively taken.

The Arminians and Socinians differed in holding that

Original sin. his original perfection did not embrace character, which was his own creation. The consequences of the fall involved, according to the old Protestant theology, not only a forfeiture of grace, and "the wounds of nature" which resulted, but, also, a total depravation or corruption of man's nature. The posterity of Adam are born sinful, and are accounted guilty of the first transgression. From this doctrine not only the Socinians, but also the Arminians dissented. The native propensity of men to sin they denied to be, in the proper sense, culpable. The Arminians taught that, as an effect of the fall, men are born in such a state of blindness and weakness that without grace they are not able to do anything righteous or acceptable to God. The sinfulness of men is the consequence of this inborn disability, and grace is its remedy. Generally, among Calvinists in the seventeenth century, the imputation of Adam's sin to men was considered the first element in original sin; but Placeus, following Calvin himself, regards inborn depravity as standing first in order. In other words, they held that imputation is *mediate*. But all united in the Augustinian, realistic conception of a participation of mankind in the fall of Adam. The doctrine of the covenant headship of Adam, or of Adam as a representative, submitting to probation for the race, was superimposed on the Augustinian view. Later, from becoming an adjunct, it came to be a substitute for it, and served then as a theory to explain why the first sin of Adam, and no other sins, were charged to the account of his posterity. That is to say, the Federal theory took the place of the Augustinian. That theory is identified with the name of Cocceius, a Dutch theologian, by whom, however, it was not originated, but fully developed. Zwingli did not admit that our native corruption is in

itself blameworthy. In England, Jeremy Taylor was one of the earlier advocates of the Arminian views on this topic.

At the outset, predestination was stoutly affirmed by the Saxon as well as the Swiss Reformers, although with Zwingli it was more a theory than a part of his practical teaching. Melanchthon renounced his former belief in unconditional election. The Lutherans, with the Arminians, taught that grace is offered to all, that God desires all to accept it, and that the influences of the Spirit are resistible. Like views prevailed extensively among the Greeks and Roman Catholics. The Jansenists revived the Augustinian idea, but were persecuted for their advocacy of it. Among Calvinists, the milder or infralapsarian doctrine of decrees, was presented in the creed of Dort and in the creed and catechisms of the Westminster Assembly. In the Roman Catholic Church, Molina, a Spanish Jesuit, published a work to reconcile differences on this theme of endless controversy. The Molinists blended with the Semi-Pelagian view what was called the *scientia media*—the opinion that God, foreseeing what each particular person would be and do, under all possible circumstances, sends to perdition such as he knows would, whatever exertions were made to persuade them, remain obdurate. The Dominicans, who followed their master, Aquinas, in making divine agency the real efficient in conversion, made war on this Molinist tenet. The prolonged deliberations of a congregation appointed by Clement VIII. to settle the dispute led to no conclusion.

The divinity of Christ and the doctrine of the two natures were accepted by all except the Socinians, by whom it was held that the man Christ Jesus, the appointed Messiah, was exalted by the merit of his obedience to a share in the divine majesty and dominion. The Lutherans differed from the Calvinists in teaching the mutual communication of the attributes of the two natures. The divine nature imparted its attributes to the human, whereby there resulted the ubiquity of the Saviour's glorified body, an essential part of the Lutheran doctrine of the sacrament. The Calvinists were inclined to make the central point—the *ego*—in the person of Jesus to be the divine Logos. Early in the seventeenth century, the *kenosis* controversy broke out between two schools in Germany—Tübingen and Giessen. The Tübingen doctors contended that Jesus, while in the flesh, renounced the *use* of divine attributes only in relation to the government of the world. The Giessen doctors extended this renunciation over the entire field of his activity. Calvin was one

Predestina-
tion.

The person
of Christ.

1616.

of those who rejected the opinion that if sin had not entered the world, Jesus would still have become incarnate.

Anselmic ideas were at the root of the old Protestant representations of the atonement. Calvin teaches that "God in a certain ineffable manner, at the same time that he loved us, was nevertheless angry with us, till he was reconciled in Christ," by whom his anger was appeased. Luther laid stress on the victory of Jesus over Satan, sin, and death. He presents profound and interesting views, akin to the ideas of the deeper mystics, on the identification of Jesus with us in love, who "deemed himself not otherwise before God his father than if he had himself done all the sin which we have done, and as if he had deserved all that which we have deserved." It was generally taught that Christ bore for us the full penalty of sin. The Arminians, however, in agreement with the idea of "acceptilation," the theory of Scotus, taught that the death of Christ had not, in itself considered, this full value, but was, by the compassion of God, taken as an equivalent, or accepted as a ransom. The Calvinistic doctrine was, that while the death of Jesus was sufficient for the salvation of all, it was intended for the benefit of the elect alone. Theology distinguished between the Saviour's active and passive obedience; the last, balancing the account for positive infractions of the law, the first, for negative omissions of duty.

Against the Anselmic, or prevalent judicial view of the atonement, a formidable attack was made by Socinus. He alleged that both sin and punishment are personal, and can neither of them be transferred. He also denied that, if the debt of penalty is paid, there is any grace in forgiveness, or any justice in requiring of the sinner anything more—for example, repentance and faith.

Grotius, the eminent Arminian jurist, took the field in opposition to Socinus. He modified the received theory by the introduction of the governmental view. The reasoning of Socinus assumed that the relation of the transgressor is that of a debtor to a creditor. This Grotius denied. His relation is that of a subject to a ruler. Now a ruler has the right to remit a penalty, provided the end for which penalty is ordained is secured. This end is the preservation of order and the prevention of future transgressions. The death of Christ secures this result as being "a penal example;" that is, as showing impressively what sin deserves, what the penalty would be if actually inflicted. It is a manifestation of the law-giver's hatred of sin. Not being the literal penalty, God may determine what further

The Gro-
talian
View of the
Atonement.

conditions are proper and requisite for the issue of a pardon. The view of Grotius is substantially the "acceptilation" theory. It proceeds on a different foundation from the Anselmic doctrine, which assumes that the execution of the penalty to the full extent is an inexorable requirement of the divine justice, or that it would not be righteous for God to spare the law-breaker until the penalty had been fully and objectively borne by himself or by a substitute.

The Protestants contended that justification is forensic. It is the acquittal of the sinner, and his acceptance by consequent adoption, on the ground of the merits of Christ. Whoever
Justification. is justified is also sanctified, but the two parts of salvation are distinct. With the Roman Catholics, "justify" means to make just. The first element is the infusion of the principle of righteousness. Pardon follows as an attendant. The imputation of the righteousness of Christ to the believer, which was affirmed by the Lutherans and Calvinists, was not admitted either by the Catholics or Arminians. The latter taught that faith is counted as righteousness through a gracious act of God. Justification, according to the Protestants, is by faith alone, which in its own nature is productive of good works. Moreover, they generally held that faith justifies, not on account of any moral excellence inhering in it, but as an instrument bringing the sinner into connection with Christ. Here the Arminians and Socinians differed. They attributed to faith an intrinsic worth in the sight of God, who accepts it as an imperfect degree of righteousness, which, on account of Christ, is reckoned as perfect. The Roman Catholics added to faith other tempers of heart, as penitence, the purpose to reform, etc., as conditions of salvation. With them it is faith mingled with charity or love, which justifies. With them faith is historical and doctrinal. Hence love must be superadded. On the contrary, in the Protestant view, faith is an act of self-committal to Christ as a Saviour both from sin and guilt. Inasmuch as, in the Catholic theology, baptism cleanses the soul of guilt, justification is rather by baptism than by faith. For all sins committed after baptism, the offender must himself make satisfaction, without which the merits of Christ will be of no avail to him.

In the early days of the Reformation it was considered by Protestants an invaluable gain from the doctrine of gratuitous
Assurance. salvation that it sets the heart of the believer at rest.

As he has only to take a gift, he is delivered from the doubt as to his forgiveness and from the consequent self-torture

which the mediæval doctrine of salvation by human merit inflicted. The Reformers were at first inclined to make assurance to be an essential element in saving faith. But they came to the conclusion, which Calvin clearly expresses, that the comfort of the believer may be disturbed by misgivings growing out of timidity and self-criticism, so that his faith may, at intervals, even be eclipsed by the clouds of fear. The Westminster creeds distinctly state that assurance is not "of the essence of saving faith."

The Calvinists differed from Augustine on one point in the doctrine respecting perseverance. They held that none of the truly converted ever fall away and fail of salvation. The

Perseverance.

Lutherans followed Augustine in his opinion that not all the regenerate are elect. The Arminians and Socinians called in question the dogma of the uniform perseverance of believers. The Protestants rejected the distinction as made by the Catholics between evangelical precepts and counsels, and with it the superior merit attached to the monastic virtues of continence, obedience, and poverty. They denied, also, that vows form a part of the system of worship, and taught that every vow taken by an individual must relate to something in his power to perform, and must be freely and deliberately made. In the Protestant system there were no mortal sins except habits and offences which are incompatible with the exercise of evangelical faith.

The Reformers denied that the Church is to be identified with the visible community of which the Pope is the head. The Church

The Church. is the society of believers in which the word is preached

and the sacraments are duly administered. It was implied in the Protestant doctrine that members of a visible Church who are not truly pious are to be distinguished from believers, who are thus the Church invisible. This distinction was first explicitly made by the Calvinists. The maxim of the Church of Rome, that "beyond the Church there is no salvation," was adopted in another sense by the Protestants, who generally held that the means of salvation are confined within the limits of Christian teaching and institutions. Protestants refused to consider the clergy as a priesthood, or as separated from the laity in any other way than as charged with certain official functions. It was held to be the right of the Church to call its ministers and appoint them, in opposition to the claim that the clergy are an order which appoints its own members, under the superintendence of a visible head, the Roman Pontiff. Protestant ideas of discipline and of excommunication were conformed to this conception of the

ministry as organs of the body of believers. The rise and spread of a modified view of the clerical office in the English Episcopal Church have already been explained. It was natural that Protestants should abolish the rule of celibacy, which continued to prevail in the Church of Rome, and, as regards bishops, in the Greek Church.

After the Reformation, Bellarmine and other Catholic theologians were disposed to dwell more on the advantage and even necessity of certain states of mind, in order that the sacraments may exert their proper efficacy. Penitence and other feelings, in addition to freedom from the guilt of mortal sin, are said to be requisite. Yet the sacraments are declared to be operative of themselves—effective *ex opere operato*. This the Protestants did not admit. They regarded them as signs of a grace imparted in conjunction with them; but in the case of adults they asserted that faith, in the sense which they attached to the term, must be in the heart of the recipient, in order that any benefit shall be received. They limited, likewise, the number of sacraments to two, baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Arminians were disinclined to regard them as vehicles of grace, or as anything more than symbols.

The Reformers, with their view of the sacraments, at first did not find it perfectly easy to define and defend the baptism of infants.

The sacraments. Luther boldly assumed that they may exercise faith even in infancy. It was agreed that baptism incorporates them into the Church and renders them partakers of its privileges. The analogy of circumcision under the old covenant was appealed to, and baptism was declared to be a substitute under the new. Calvin and his followers are emphatic on this point. Zwingli interprets infant baptism as a consecration of children to God by their parents. But he appeals, also, to the analogy of circumcision. Calvin asserts of elect infants that baptism is a symbol of their regeneration. He says that God "has his different degrees of regenerating those whom he has adopted." The Liturgy of the English Episcopal Church teaches that "a mystical washing away of sin" attends the baptism of infants. The prayer is offered that the water may be sanctified to effect this result. The divines of this Church held, in common with most of the Protestant leaders, that by this rite the stain of hereditary guilt is effaced. But it was often explained that the regeneration of the infant requires to be followed by his conversion through the voluntary exercise of faith and repentance. The seed sown at baptism may fall into barren soil.

Infant baptism.

The Augsburg Confession allowed the necessity of baptism for salvation, as the Catholics had held; but afterwards this opinion was repudiated by most Protestants. It is emphatically denied in the Scottish Confession. The contempt, not the deprivation of the sacraments, they condemned as perilous to the soul. By avowing that "grace is not tied to the sacraments," the Calvinists rendered it possible to hold that infants, even the infant offspring of the heathen, may be saved. This merciful opinion was actually favored by both Zwingli and Bullinger. But most Calvinists went no farther than to believe in the salvation of "elect infants." They even refrained from affirming that all who are baptized in infancy are of this number, and held out no promise respecting the children of Christian parents who have culpably neglected to bring them to the font. Hooker teaches "the great likelihood" of the salvation of even unbaptized offspring of *Christian* parents, dying in infancy. But he abstains from any utterance to this effect respecting the offspring of the heathen, whatever, on this point, his opinion may have been.

The principal opinions adopted among Protestants on the Lord's Supper have already been stated. They all abjured the doctrine of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass. The co-presence of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, and the actual reception of Christ by believer and unbeliever alike, continued to be the Lutheran tenet. On the reformed side, Calvin's view of a spiritual reception of Christ, by the believer alone, prevailed over the Zwinglian opinion, and was commonly adopted. It is definitely stated in the Articles of the Church of England. In the creeds of the Greek Church, in this period, transubstantiation is, for the first time, definitely professed.

The civil magistracy is a prominent topic in the Protestant creeds. The right and duty of the civil authority to uphold the Church, to provide for the public teaching of the gospel, and to suppress dangerous errors and factions, was the common doctrine of Protestants. Where Protestantism prevailed, governments assumed the regulation of Church affairs. It was from the Calvinists that resistance to the exercise within the Church of State control generally proceeded. But Calvinism laid on the State the obligation to stand by the Church, and to co-operate in carrying out its discipline. The Independents, and especially the Baptists, broached theories restricting political action within narrower limits.

Respecting the observance of the Lord's Day, the Reformers, including Knox as well as Luther and Calvin, refused to identify the New Testament institution with the Old Testament Sabbath, or to found the observance of Sunday on the statute in the decalogue. Generally they made the fourth commandment typical of the entire rest and peace granted to Christians under the gospel. This is the explanation of Calvin. The Synod of Dort ascribed validity to the moral part of the commandment, from which it inferred the duty of observing a "certain and stated day appointed for worship." Hooker inculcates the same opinion; and, after his time, Ussher, Pearson, and other noted Anglican divines. The Puritan doctrine of a continued obligation to obey the fourth commandment as being a moral injunction, intended, therefore, for all mankind, is said to have been first definitely expounded in 1595, in a publication which was suppressed by Whitgift. But as early as 1562, a General Assembly in Scotland refers to Sabbath-breaking as a violation of divine law which the State ought to punish. The perpetual obligation of the fourth commandment is incorporated in the Westminster Confession. This view was generally adopted in Great Britain, and among Protestants in the United States. On the continent, the opinion and practice of the Reformers continued to prevail.

Protestants rejected the doctrine of purgatory. In their principal versions of the Bible, they rendered "Sheol" in the Old Testament, and "Hades" in the New, by the word "hell," the translation, also, of the term "gehenna." The Westminster creeds assert that heaven and hell are the only "two places for souls separated from their bodies;" and to the phrase in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into hell," they attach the unhistorical sense that "He continued in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day." But the doctrine of an intermediate state, not involving, however, any opportunity for repentance, was advanced by English divines, among whom are included Burnet and Pearson. Later, the same tenet was avowed by certain German theologians, and was defended by Dr. George Campbell, a Scottish theologian, in his "Dissertations on the Gospels." The final judgment and the eternity of reward and punishment were generally affirmed in the Protestant creeds. Individuals like Locke avowed the doctrine of the annihilation of the hopelessly wicked. This, the Socinians said, was the meaning of the "second death."

In the creeds of the Greek Church, departed souls, penitent, yet still owing satisfaction and the fruits of repentance, receive disciplinary punishment, but of a purely spiritual nature, in Hades. This approaches near to the Roman doctrine of purgatory.

CHAPTER XI.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

MORE than one hundred years before the beginning of the Reformation, the missionary activity of the Church was suspended. If much had already been accomplished in the spread of the gospel, quite as much still remained to be done.

Loss of missionary zeal.

Although all the countries of Europe, except Lapland, were nominally Christian, Asia Minor, Palestine, and Northern Africa, the earliest homes of Christianity, had long since been subjected to the yoke of Islam. Of the many communities of believers which once flourished in these regions, only a few feeble churches or heretical sects had survived. Prominent among these were the Armenians, the Nestorians, and the Copts. From Asia, Mohammedanism had advanced into Southeastern Europe, and threatened to reduce still further the bounds of Christendom. But popes as well as princes were too much absorbed in schemes of worldly ambition to seek earnestly for the triumph of the gospel over its enemies. In the Spanish peninsula, nevertheless, where there was a constant struggle with the Moslems, something of the old missionary ardor burned in the hearts of the people.

The great maritime discoveries of the fifteenth century were made principally under the auspices of Portugal and Spain, which held the dominion of the seas. As a motive in their expeditions, there mingled with curiosity, with the spirit of adventure and cupidity, the desire to propagate the Catholic faith in regions unknown. Vasco da Gama rounded the Cape of Good Hope, and in 1498 reached the Malabar coast. This grand achievement opened the way for Portuguese colonization, and for the planting of the cross in India and the islands of the East. The rapacity and cruelty of the explorers made the labors of the Franciscans of comparatively little avail, and what religion existed among the European colonists themselves, in the course of a half-century, became a lifeless form and interposed no check to the worst sort of

Maritime discoveries.

immorality. About the middle of the sixteenth century, as we shall see, a new enterprise was undertaken for the diffusion of the Roman Catholic faith in these regions.

Columbus was imbued with religious feelings when he set out on the voyage which led him to the West Indies, instead of the India of the East, which he sought. Of the early missionaries in the lands which the Spanish navigators and conquerors seized, those of the Dominican order were

Missions in
the West
Indies.

the most effective. If in the Old World the Dominicans wielded the cruel instruments of the Inquisition, in the New they were actuated by more humane sentiments. Among them, and among all the missionaries of that day, the most eminent, and the most worthy

of eminence, was Bartholomew de Las Casas, a native of

Las Casas.

Seville, where he was born in 1474. His father accompanied Columbus in his first voyage of discovery, but the son first came to Hispaniola with Ovando in 1502. There he was ordained, being the first man who received priestly ordination in America. His career was long and eventful. It was distinguished by the most arduous and persevering endeavors to deliver the natives from the oppressive slavery to which they were reduced by the system of *repartimientos*, established by the Spaniards, which made them virtually the property of the owners of the land. Not accustomed to hard labor, and driven to work in the mines and pearl-fisheries, under barbarous masters, their sufferings were intolerable. With the wickedness of this system of slavery Las Casas was suddenly struck, in 1514, while preparing a sermon on Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 18-22. The last verse reads : "He that taketh away his neighbor's living slayeth him ; and he that defraudeth the laborer of his hire is a blood-shedder." Las Casas had the co-operation of the great Cardinal Ximenes, who was regent after the death of Ferdinand ; but for the most of his life he had to contend against antagonists who were bound together by their common greed of gain, and were too often able to baffle, even when they could not directly overthrow, his plans. He was not always discreet, and in adjusting the relation of the two races he made, perhaps, too little allowance for difficulties that were insuperable. But of the nobleness of his aims there can be no question. "He crossed the ocean twelve times ; he traversed every then known region of America and the islands ; he made repeated journeys from Spain to Flanders and Germany, to see the emperor on the affairs of his mission ; his literary labors would have been remarkable even in a scholar who had no calling outside of the halls of his college or the quiet

of his private study." There is one blot on the reputation of Las Casas. He did not originate, but he sanctioned the scheme of supplying the place of the natives of the West Indies, whom the colonists were reducing to slavery, by negroes imported from Negro slavery. Africa. He thus helped forward the African slave-trade and the introduction of negro slavery into America. His reasons were a desire to spare the converts, and the fact that the Africans could toil in that climate without the same danger to health and life. But in his History of the Indies, which he wrote in later years, he deploras his mistake. He says that if he "had apprehended the nature of the thing," this advice he "would not have given for all he had in the world. For he always held that they had been made slaves unjustly and tyrannically, since the same reason holds good of them as of the Indians." During the half-century that preceded the discovery of America, the slave-trade had been carried forward on the coast of Africa by Spain and Portugal. In 1495 and 1498, Columbus sent home cargoes of slaves from the West Indies. It was Isabella who forbade this practice, and ordered all slaves unjustly captured to be sent back to Hispaniola. But her decree allowed Indians who were taken in a righteous war to be enslaved, and thus opened a door for the seizing of as many as the local authorities, by an abuse of this privilege, might choose to capture.

In the first age of the Reformation, missionary zeal was mostly confined to the Roman Catholics. The Protestant churches were Relation of Protestants to missions. in the process of organizing themselves, and for a long time they were in a battle for their existence. It may be added that there were some of the Reformers, among whom was Luther himself, who looked for the second coming of the Lord as soon to occur. The power of Antichrist had reached its climax. Those nations which were to accept the message of salvation were already gathered into the Church. And now, after the gospel had been preached in its purity, the end was to come. The conversion of the heathen thus occupied no place in the thoughts of the great leader of the Reformation. In this respect he was far behind Erasmus, who eloquently, and in a truly evangelical spirit, urged the sending of missionaries to those who had never heard the gospel, and even to its most uncompromising enemies, the Mohammedans. The followers of Luther for more than a century entertained the same prejudice against missions. When Baron von Welz, in 1664, published an appeal to "all Right-believing Christians of the Augsburg Confession regarding

a Special Society, through which, with Divine Help, our Evangelical Religion could be extended," his plans were stigmatized by a prominent theologian as a "dream," and the idea of casting "the holy things of God" before such "dogs and swine" as the heathen were, was treated with indignant scorn. This lack of sympathy with missionary efforts was due in some measure to the fact that the Germans took no part in the maritime enterprises of the age, and were therefore not brought into contact with the newly discovered peoples of the East and West. Other Protestant nations—the English in their American colonies, the Dutch in the East Indies—made praiseworthy attempts to Christianize the native tribes. Their work, however, was not begun until the seventeenth century. For a long time after the rise of Protestantism, the maritime ascendancy of the Catholic nations was not subverted. It was thus that the earliest opportunities for missionary enterprise were offered to the Church of Rome.

With the counter-reformation, there appeared, along with the passionate ardor for converting apostates in Europe and winning back lost territory, a burning desire to spread the dominion of the Church in the heathen world. The Jesuits were the most zealous of all the orders in each department of this holy crusade. The most famous and the most successful of

Jesuit mis-
sions.

Xavier,
1506-1552.

the Jesuit missionaries was Francis Xavier, by whom Christianity was carried to India and the far East, and who is revered among Roman Catholics as another Apostle Paul. He was a room-mate, and one of the earliest followers, of Ignatius. In the hospitals at Venice he fought down his instinctive repugnance to contact with loathsome forms of disease, by forcing himself to needless and nauseating services in ministering to the sick and wounded. In obedience to the request of the King of Portugal that Ignatius would furnish him with missionaries for the Portuguese settlements in the East, Xavier, who was made by the pope apostolic nuncio for India, sailed from Lisbon, and, after touching at Mozambique, Melinda, and Socotra, landed at Goa on the 6th of May, 1542. On the voyage he devoted himself to the care of the sailors who were ill. Wherever he preached, at the places at which he stopped, a marked effect was produced. Xavier was an ascetic who shrunk from no austerities, but rather delighted in opportunities of self-mortification. He would do penance vicariously, scourging himself with the utmost severity, in order to impress one whom he sought to move to contrition. Resolute, and unshaken by opposition, he was naturally kind, and

his religious feelings did not lack a certain elevation, as may be seen from his hymn, beginning—

“Jesus! I love thee,—not because
I hope for heaven thereby—”

At Goa he made the beginning of a great evangelizing work, which he effected in the nominally Christian settlements and among the natives in that region. He won a multitude of converts among the Paravas, a people of low caste in the extreme south of the peninsula. His labors were extended to Malacca, the Moluccas, and other islands of the Eastern archipelago. His method, as pursued at Travancore, is thus described by himself: “As soon as I arrived in any heathen village where they had sent for me to give baptism, I gave orders for all—men, women, and children—to be collected in one place. Then, beginning with the first elements of the Christian faith, I taught them there is one God—I made them each make three times the sign of the cross; then, putting on a surplice, I began to recite, in a loud voice and in their own language, the form of general confession, the Apostles’ Creed, the ten commandments, the Lord’s Prayer, the *Ave Maria*, and the *Salve Regina*. Two years ago, I translated all these prayers into the language of the country, and learned them by heart. I recited them so that all, of every age and condition, followed me in them. Then I began to explain shortly the articles of the creed and the ten commandments in the language of the country. When the people appeared to me sufficiently instructed to receive baptism, I ordered them all to ask God’s pardon publicly for the sins of their past life, and to do this with a loud voice and in the presence of their neighbors still hostile to the Christian religion, in order to touch the hearts of the heathen and confirm the faith of the good. All the heathen are filled with admiration at the holiness of the law of God, and express the greatest shame at having lived so long in ignorance of the true God. They willingly hear about the mysteries and rules of the Christian religion, and treat me, poor sinner as I am, with the greatest respect. Many, however, put away from them with hardness of heart the truth which they well know. When I have done my instruction, I ask, one by one, all those who desire baptism if they believe without hesitation in each of the articles of the faith. All immediately, holding their arms in the form of the cross, declare with one voice that they believe all entirely. Then at last I baptize them in due form, and I give to each his name written on a ticket. After their

Xavier’s
method.

baptism the new Christians go back to their houses and bring me their wives and families for baptism. When all are baptized I order all the temples of their false gods to be destroyed and all the idols to be broken in pieces. I can give you no idea of the joy I feel in seeing this done, witnessing the destruction of the idols by the very people who but lately adored them. In all the towns and villages I leave the Christian doctrine in writing in the language of the country, and I prescribe at the same time the manner in which it is to be taught in the morning and evening schools. When I have done all this in one place, I pass to another, and so on successively to the rest. In this way I go all round the country, bringing the natives into the fold of Jesus Christ, and the joy that I feel in this is far too great to be expressed in a letter, or even by word of mouth."

In 1549, under great difficulties and dangers, he made his way to Japan. He gained by conciliation the good-will of bonzes, the Buddhistic religious guides, a few of whom were converted. Three powerful nobles adopted the Christian religion. Of the Japanese he wrote, "They generally sin through ignorance." "The labors which are undergone for the conversion of a people so rational, so desirous to know the truth and be saved, result in very sweet fruit to the soul." He took special delight in the zeal of the neophytes for the conversion of others. He was occasionally allowed to preach, through an interpreter, to vast assemblies. Xavier had long been desirous of making a missionary campaign in China, but just as he was about to enter that country his life terminated. He died on the island of San Chan, December 2, 1552. In his last letter, written about three weeks before (November 13th), he expresses the confident hope that he will "place his foot at last on Chinese ground." Of the resistance which he conceives Satan to be making to this holy purpose he discourses in a vein that reminds one of utterances of Luther in reference to the warfare waged by the evil one against the plans of God's people: "The devil has an unspeakable dread of the Society of Jesus entering China, and every effort in this direction seems to wound the very apple of his eye; it makes him rage with impotent fury and boil over with passion. . . . I perceive most clearly that the war-cry has sounded in the camp of hell, and the spirits of darkness, all in consternation, are arrayed against us as if to defend their last intrenchments." Probably no missionary ever made a larger number of professed converts to the Christian faith. Concerning the numerous miracles, some of them of an astounding character,

Xavier in
Japan.

which were related of him, he—his biographers tell us, from motives of modesty—is silent. He was beatified—declared to be already among the blessed—in 1619, and canonized in 1622.

In India Robert Nobili, a Jesuit, in 1606 undertook to reach the Brahminical caste by assuming to belong to it himself, and by withdrawing from intercourse even with the Christian converts, who were generally of the lowest caste. He succeeded by this sort of conformity in winning proselytes in the higher ranks, but the result of his policy was vigorous opposition from other orders, and from the authorities of the Church. This finally led to the breaking up of the Jesuit missions. In China, a

like accommodating policy was undertaken in 1582 by Matthew Ricci, a member of the same order, who took

on him the character of a mandarin, and by his mathematical and astronomic knowledge, and by important services to the Chinese Government, opened the way for an extensive diffusion of the Roman Catholic system in that empire. Their accommodation to the heathen usages involved the Jesuits in China in the same troubles as those which befell their brethren in India. In Japan, Xavier's converts, on account of his ignorance of the language, were not numerous. But the Jesuit fathers who followed, reaped where he had sown. They won a multitude of adherents. Shinto, the native religion of Japan, offered no comfort in the midst of the anarchy and distress which had long prevailed in the country. Buddhism, with its showy and magnificent ritual, was little more than a lifeless tradition. Its gorgeous costumes and ceremonies, and its hierarchical organization, were rivalled, if not eclipsed, by the corresponding features of the Roman Catholic system that now entered into competition with it. Circumstances for a considerable time favored the Jesuit preachers. So great was the progress of their cause that before the end of the century the number of Christians in Japan is said to have been not less than six hundred thousand. But fatal disasters overtook the newly founded church. The advance of Christianity had been owing in no small degree to the support of a powerful general, Nobunaga, who had employed the Christian converts in the contest which he was waging with the Buddhistic chiefs. By the aid of two commanders, Hidéyoshi and Iyéyasū, he brought a great part of Japan under the authority of the Mikado, in whose name he governed.

Destruction
of Christians
in Japan

But, at a later day, Iyéyasū became hostile to the Christians, who were bold enough to offer armed resistance to daimios, their feudal superiors, defenders of Buddhism.

These began to use force against the cause which the Jesuits had encouraged their predecessors to promote by the same sort of coercion. He suspected that the Christian peasants were instigated to resist the lords by foreigners. In 1606 an edict was issued from Yedo against Christian worship. In 1611 Iyéyasū obtained evidence, as he believed, of a conspiracy of native converts and foreigners to overthrow the independence of Japan. The foreigners, and, in particular, the Portuguese, had embarked in the slave-trade, and had exported thousands of Japanese, whom they had bought for the purpose, to Macao and to the Philippine Islands. The Dutch and the English, who were Protestants, were inimical to the Spanish and Portuguese; the Spaniards and Portuguese were ready to accuse one another; the missionaries of rival orders, who had come into the country, quarrelled with the Jesuits. New edicts against the Christian religion were promulgated by the native authorities. The chiefs who espoused the cause of the Jesuits were defeated. This resulted, in 1615, in an immense slaughter of native converts. In 1624 all foreigners, except Dutch and Chinese, were banished from the country. Frightful persecutions ensued, in which the Japanese Christians evinced an unshaken fortitude. At length, in 1637, the Christians rose in revolt, but were defeated by the Shogun's troops. The result, it has been believed until recently, was the utter extirpation of the Christian religion in the country. But French missionaries who came to Nagasaki in 1860, found in that district not less than ten thousand Christians, the offspring of those who survived the sanguinary persecutions of the seventeenth century. The Christianity that was planted in Japan by the Jesuits and by other missionaries of the Church of Rome, left no perceptible mark on the moral and spiritual character of the Japanese people.

Cortez, the conqueror of Mexico, like all Spanish cavaliers of that time, was enthusiastic in the desire to make proselytes of the heathen whose land he invaded. The means of achieving this result were to be preaching, united with force.

Catholic missionaries in Mexico.

Two ecclesiastics accompanied his expedition, one of whom, Bartolomé de Olmedo, was a man of fervent charity, as well as zeal, and did what he could to restrain the ferocity of the conquerors. After the country was subdued, Cortez procured the sending out of twelve Franciscan friars, who reached Mexico in 1524. He had urgently requested that they should be men of godly lives, whose example would reinforce their precepts, and in this wish he was not disappointed. They engaged in their work with ardor and

self-denial. In twenty years the Mexican tribes were persuaded or coerced into a conformity to the religion of their masters. "The Aztec worship was remarkable for its burdensome ceremonial, and prepared its votaries for the pomp and splendors of the Roman ritual. It was not difficult to pass from the fasts and festivals of the one religion to the fasts and festivals of the other ; to transfer their homage from the fantastic idols of their own creation to the beautiful forms in sculpture and in painting which decorated the Christian cathedral." The Mexican converts understood little of the doctrines of Christianity, and they might be little affected by its spirit ; but it was a great gain to substitute the "unsullied rites" of the Church of Rome for the "brutal abominations of the Aztecs."

The Franciscans also attempted to found missions in Paraguay, which had been in possession of the Spaniards after 1536. But their work was overshadowed by the labors of the Jesuits among the Indians who dwelt beyond the banks of the River Paraná. There the members of this order, in the early years of the seventeenth century, were authorized by Philip III. of Spain to build up a civil community, which was to be independent of the colonial governors, and from which all Spaniards might be excluded. Not only the spiritual but the temporal destinies of each *reduction*, as a new settlement was called, were in the hands of the father who was its chief magistrate and who owed obedience to none but the superior of the missions. He directed the labors of the neophytes and distributed to them according to their necessities the products which their toil had gathered into the common storehouse. They possessed no private property. Theirs was a communistic state, under the rule of heaven-sent guides—a bondage during which their souls were prepared for eternal bliss. The hatred which brought about the ruin of the followers of Loyola in Europe, likewise put an end to this Jesuitical Utopia.

The first half of the sixteenth century had hardly passed before the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the Jesuits had begun to labor among the Indians who lived in the southern part of what is now the United States. The explorations of Cartier and Champlain along the St. Lawrence opened the way for a similar work there. Quebec in 1615, seven years after it was founded, and Montreal in 1641, the year of its settlement, became missionary centres. The region covered by the Northeastern States and by Canada was then inhabited by two great families of Indians, the Algonquins and the Iroquois. Related to

Missions in
Canada and
near the lakes.

the latter in origin and in language were the Hurons, who dwelt near the lake which bears their name. The attempt to convert these tribes was beset by peculiar difficulties. They were engaged in fierce wars of mutual extermination. The Hurons and the Iroquois, rivals and bitter enemies, were far in advance of other Indians in prowess and intelligence, and in material civilization. They had deeply rooted ideas and cherished customs which were foreign to the most elementary principles of Christianity. Besides, they were in the full enjoyment of savage prosperity, cared nothing for the consolations of religion, and hated its restraints. The labors of the Jesuits among them, and especially among the Hurons, were characterized by a noble self-denial and patience, by an undaunted perseverance in the face of innumerable difficulties and dangers, and by a calm submission to the appalling fate which Indian ferocity often brought upon them. In Canada they took up the work which the capture of Quebec by the English in 1629 compelled the Franciscans to abandon. But notwithstanding their first successes, their efforts produced few permanent results. The prosperous mission which they began at Tadousac for the Algonquins who lived along the banks of the Saguenay was destroyed by pestilence and by the arms of the Iroquois. The other Algonquin settlements farther up the St. Lawrence, likewise came to a disastrous end.

The Huron
mission.

The most notable of all the Jesuit missions was that established by Brébeuf in 1634 among the Hurons. Here he and his brethren labored patiently, but accomplished little except among the children, who gathered at the chapel to learn the commandments and the prayers of the Church. Soon the terrible pestilence which everywhere attended the progress of the Europeans through the Indian country, came to humble the pride of the Hurons and make them attentive to the message of the priests. But this humility was of short duration. Incited by the medicine-men, they accused the Jesuits of sorcery, and determined upon their death. The fearless attitude of the missionaries disarmed their enemies. Although the fathers were frequently repelled from the cabins of the sick, and were hooted in the streets, their lives were no longer in danger. Gradually they gained a few converts. In 1640 the Huron Christians numbered one hundred. As the miseries which befell the tribe—war, famine, and pestilence—increased, they turned more readily to the Jesuits for guidance and instruction. But this nation, like the Algonquins, was doomed. Bands of Iroquois in 1648 destroyed St. Joseph and slew Father Daniel, one of the first associates of Brébeuf in the Huron mission. The follow-

ing year, many other towns were either burned by the same relentless foe or abandoned by their inhabitants. At St. Louis, Brébeuf and Lalemant were captured, and put to death after being subjected to the most horrible tortures. Thus perished the Huron mission. In December, 1649, a like fate overtook that of the Tobacco nation. St. Jean was destroyed, and Father Garnier, a man of noble birth and sensitive nature, was tomahawked while endeavoring to drag himself to the side of a dying Indian that he might administer to him the last consolations of the Catholic faith. A few years later,

Mission to the Iroquois. the Iroquois, wasted by their continual wars, made peace with the French and asked for missionaries. The Jesuits did not hesitate to go to this nation, at whose hands several of their brethren had suffered death. Out of the Hurons whom they found scattered among the tribes of their conquerors, they formed the nucleus of a Christian community. But these missionary efforts, after being repeatedly interrupted by new wars, ceased in 1687. In the meantime, other members of the order had pushed farther west, following the retreating footsteps of the Hurons, or seeking to carry the gospel to tribes living along the shores of Lake Michigan. Father Marquette, in 1673, accompanied Joliet in his voyage down the Mississippi. One of the results of this memorable journey was the establishment of a mission among the Illinois Indians. Thus the Jesuits labored on. They were never far behind the daring men who at this time were eagerly exploring the wilds of America. Everywhere they planted the cross and sought to teach the natives the rudiments of the Catholic faith. Their work was brought to an end by the suppression of their order in France in the following century.

CHAPTER XII.

PROTESTANT SETTLEMENTS AND COMMUNITIES IN AMERICA.

THE Spaniards took possession of the Southern coast of America. The French settlements were in the North. The Middle Atlantic coast, with its moderate and healthful climate, was left for the Protestant nations, and especially for England, to colonize. The

Two classes of Puritan emigrants. founders of New England were Puritans, but Puritans of two quite different classes, which, however, became amalgamated after their settlement in the New World. The Plymouth colonists who came over in the Mayflower in 1620 were

Independents. They belonged to the separatists from the Anglican Church who had renounced the Establishment in England, and abjured altogether the theory of a national church. On the other hand, the settlers of Massachusetts Bay and of Connecticut were Puritans who, in the mother country, had labored not to abolish, but to reform the national Church, according to their own ideas, which corresponded to those of Calvinists generally on the Continent. Before their migration, much as they objected to certain features of the Anglican polity and ritual, they had never renounced their connection with the Episcopal Church as established by law.

The Act of Uniformity passed in the first year of Elizabeth's reign, and the legalized supremacy of the queen in ecclesiastical as well as civil concerns, made all deviation from the modes of belief and worship which were ordained by law punishable by the civil authority; and the Court of High Commission was instituted to extirpate dissent and heresy. As early, perhaps, as 1567 there are traces of a small congregation or society in London which was made up of devout persons to whom not only prelacy was obnoxious, but also the whole system of established or national churches. Independents, as those who embraced this tenet were styled, attracted hostile attention in the diocese of Norwich. In 1583, two clergymen, Thacker and Copping, who had previously been shut up in prison, were put to death on the charge of sedition; their offence having been the implied denial of the queen's supremacy. Previously, another clergyman,

Robert Browne, a kinsman of the queen's great counsellor, Burleigh, after being once at least in prison in Norwich, escaped in 1582 to Middleburg in Holland, where he gathered a congregation of Independents like himself, and issued writings in favor of "a reformation without tarrying." Browne was a man of unstable character. On returning to England, in 1591, he saved his life by submission to the laws, and accepted preferment in the Church. He became the rector of a parish, led an idle and profligate life, but was a beneficed clergyman when he died, which was in 1630. The name of "Brownists" was long attached to the Independents by their enemies, from the prominence which for a time he had among them. Of a totally different spirit were the

Barrowe and Greenwood. Congregationalist martyrs, Henry Barrowe and John Greenwood, who were executed in 1593. Both were graduates of Cambridge. Barrowe belonged to a good family, studied law, and was "a flourishing courtier in his time;" but, after

his conversion, surprised his friends by the sobriety of his conduct and his religious earnestness. In his examinations before Whitgift and other members of the High Commission Court, at Lambeth, he denied that the Church of England in its national form is the true Church of Christ. He denied that the queen could make any laws for the Church which were not first made by Christ. He asserted that each particular church should govern itself, and have an eldership of its own. He pronounced the composition of forms of prayer in the Church to be wrong, and went beyond the ordinary Puritans by repudiating every "prescript stinted liturgy" as an undertaking "to teach the Spirit of God and to take away his office." Barrowe's treatment of the laymen before whom he was arraigned was civil; but for the prelates he manifested no respect. He evidently regarded them as Knox and Luther would have looked on priests or papal inquisitors. He told the archbishop to his face that he was "void of all true learning and godliness." In his case, as was true of other early Independent champions, a burning zeal begot a vituperative style of speech, as well as whimsies in the sphere of opinion, which wore off in process of time and under the guidance of more

judicious leaders. John Penry was a young Welshman, Penry. who also took his degree at Cambridge, and had preached in his own country and in Scotland, and occasionally to the Independent flock in London. He was hanged, in 1593, as a seditious disturber and a sympathizer with Barrowe and Greenwood. He had earnestly complained of non-preaching incumbents of livings as no true ministers. This was deemed one of his chief offences. He was falsely charged with taking part in the publishing of the Marprelate tracts. Penry was in his thirty-fourth year when he perished on the scaffold. His truly Christian temper, and the cruel blow inflicted by his death upon a young wife and a group of children,

rendered his fate peculiarly tragic. Francis Johnson, Johnson. made pastor of the Independent church, was cast into prison, and, after Greenwood's death, was banished from the kingdom for life. He was a clergyman, educated at Cambridge, and when driven from England became pastor of a separatist congregation at Amsterdam, where the learned Henry Ainsworth was the teacher. At this time, it was estimated that there were about twenty thousand

Independents scattered over England. At Scrooby, in The Scrooby congregation. Nottinghamshire, the humble church grew up that was destined to furnish the first emigrants to New England. There in the manor-house which was occupied by William Brewster, by his invitation, meetings were held for worship of such as shared

in his religious tenets. Brewster had studied at Cambridge, had been attached to Davison, one of the queen's secretaries for foreign affairs, and was then "master of the posts," or postmaster, of the place where he lived. Later he became a ruling elder in the society. Among the members was William Bradford, one of those who came to the meetings in the manor-house from Austerfield, a neighboring village. The teacher of this Independent church was

John Robinson, a master of arts at Cambridge, who had Robinson.

been a fellow at Corpus Christi College. He, more than any other, is to be considered the founder of Independency as a developed and organized system. Harassed by the prosecuting officers of the law, the church at Scrooby determined at last to leave home and country in a body, and to make for themselves an abode in Holland. After undergoing much peril and suffering—since their attempts to embark were baffled by the agents of the government—they succeeded, in 1608, in reaching Amsterdam. Dissensions among the Independents there, many of whom were more radical and less wise than Robinson, determined him and his flock, in 1609,

to make another change. They removed to Leyden, where At Leyden.

Brewster became a printer and teacher, and where the congregation of English rustics engaged in occupations to which they had never been accustomed, but which yielded them a hard-earned livelihood. Robinson was a man of uncommon gifts of intellect as well as rare virtues of character, a learned theologian, and an accomplished writer. So highly was he esteemed that he was chosen by the university to contend in debate with Episcopius, the able champion of Arminianism. More and more his mind had become liberalized. Without changing his fundamental position, he abandoned certain notions that he had previously held in common with his brethren—for example, that the church-edifices which had been used by Roman Catholics should be abandoned and demolished. He acknowledged the parish churches in England to be true churches, although sadly defective in discipline; did not think it wrong occasionally to hear their rectors, and with his people did not refuse to admit to communion with his church Dutch Christians of approved piety. He discerned and pointed out the futility of coercion in matters of religion, and the duty and advantages of toleration. After about ten years, he and his congregation, which was to keep up its character as a pilgrim church, concluded that Holland was not the place where they should remain and bring up their children. They were an isolated community, with the prospect before them of dissolution rather than of growth. They could not

go back to England without either forsaking their principles or being struck down as rebels against the existing order of Church and State. It was resolved that a part of the church should depart for America and begin a settlement, where they were to be joined by Robinson and the rest of their brethren as soon as difficulties in the way of their removal could be overcome. In accordance with an arrangement made with certain English merchants, who expected to get the lion's share in the profits of the undertaking, the pilgrims at last, after multiplied dangers and delays, landed on the

Settlement at
Plymouth. New England coast on December 20, 1620. Before

landing they framed a compact of civil government in the cabin of the Mayflower. The country of which they took possession lay within the domains of the Plymouth Company, which divided with the Virginia Company, by royal grant, the Atlantic coast and the regions westward as far as the Pacific. The lands, however, were purchased by the Pilgrims—as was true of the New England Puritans generally—of the Indians, for what, under the circumstances, was a fair equivalent. The first winter passed by the heroic and patient band of Christians who built their log-houses on the bleak coast was one of almost unexampled hardship. No man whose heart is not of stone can read, without deep emotion, the simple record of one of their number, the historian Bradford. They comprised only one hundred and ten persons. Before the spring came, they had buried under the snow one-half of the little company. At one time only six or seven were strong enough to nurse the sick and to attend to the burial of the dead. In this small number of untiring helpers of their brethren were Brewster, their ruling elder, who acted as teacher, and Miles Standish, their military leader. The Plymouth Colony grew slowly. It never became strong in numbers. But the "Old Colony," as it came to be called in after-times, made up for its comparative weakness from a material point of view, by the moral influence which flowed from its example of Christian courage and excellence, and through its greater charity in respect to religious differences. The Pilgrims did not forget the parting counsels of Robinson, just as they were

Robinson's
counsels.

about to sail from Delftshaven. He took occasion "to bewail the state and condition of the Reformed churches, which had come to a period in religion, and could go no further than the instruments of their reformation, Luther and Calvin." He exhorted them "to receive whatsoever light or truth" should be made known from God's written Word. It was not possible, he added "that the Christian world should come so lately out of such

thick Antichristian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once."

Soon after the beginning of the Plymouth settlement, Puritans in England began to give up the hope of relief from persecution for non-conformity and for efforts to reform the established ecclesiastical system. Laud was coming into power as the principal adviser of Charles I. in matters ecclesiastical, and as the vigilant and unsparing oppressor of dissenters from his system. These circumstances led to the great Puritan emigration to Massachusetts. In 1628 "The Company of Massachusetts Bay" purchased from "the Council for New England" the lands between the Merrimac and the Charles Rivers. The next year, the company obtained a charter from Charles I. They sent out a party of colonists under John Endicott, who settled at Salem. In 1630 the company took the bold step of transferring themselves and their charter, and thus the government of the settlements to be established under it, to New England. In that year, nearly fifteen hundred Puritan emigrants, in thirteen vessels,

The Puritan
emigration.

with John Winthrop, the governor, came over, and settled Charlestown, Boston, and other places in the neighborhood. The Massachusetts settlers were dissatisfied members of the Church of England, their "dear mother church," as they did not cease to call it. The ministers who accompanied them, or joined their colony later, such as Higginson, Cotton, Hooker, were ordained clergymen, and a number of them clergymen honored and well known in the Anglican Established Church. No sooner, however, did the Massachusetts settlers find themselves on the shores of New England, and free from restraint, than they proceeded to organize a church system in no essential particulars at variance with that of their neighbors at Plymouth, and of Independents generally. Robinson had told the Pilgrims: "There will be no difference between the conformable ministers and you, when they come to the practice of the ordinances out of the kingdom" of England. The local church was to be composed of those only who gave credible evidence of regeneration. It elected its own officers—a teacher to inculcate doctrine, a pastor to exhort and to console, and a ruling lay elder. These together were the inner presbytery of the church, having a concurrent authority with the body of its members; but all important acts required the votes of a major part of the communicants, who were united together by a covenant. At the very outset, at Salem, the ministers, who were in orders in the Church of England, were first

The Massa-
chusetts Col-
ony.

elected by a church, formed on the basis of a simple covenant, to be its ministers, one of them to serve as the "pastor," the other as the "teacher." Ordination followed upon the election of ministers, since they were regarded, not as an order but simply as officers of the local church. Their functions were confined by its limits, and by the period in which they held their offices. They might not even officiate in any other church without its consent and invitation. Moreover, the liturgy and all written prayers were discarded. This is one of the most remarkable illustrations of the rapid movements that took place in that age of change. Cotton, the minister of Boston, in 1635 wrote to his former congregation in England that if he were with them he should no more dare to "joyne in Book-prayers." Some of the Puritan ministers in England wrote over to the ministers of New England, complaining of these alterations of opinion and practice. In Massachusetts Bay, and afterwards in the New Haven Colony, the right to vote and hold office was given to church members exclusively. The founders of New England did not adopt the modern doctrine of universal suffrage. Rousseau had not written "The Social Contract," nor Locke his treatises on civil government. The Puritans were led to emigrate, preeminently, by religious motives. They wished to lodge political power in the hands of good men. Hence the restriction just mentioned was established in the civil polity of these two colonies, which thus became, in a sense, theocratic communities. The civil authorities, the governor and assistants, and the house of deputies when it was instituted, were composed of members of the churches. This constitution was not adopted on the ground of a theory that the exercise of the powers of government belongs of right to the Church exclusively. This theory Davenport disavowed. He distinguished between what might be best in "a commonwealth yet to be settled," and one "already settled." Let it be observed that the peculiarity of the system did not lie in the requirement of membership in the church as a qualification for enjoying political privileges; for the same requirement existed in England. It lay, rather, in the limiting of the number of communicants in the church to such as were judged to be regenerate. In the polity of Connecticut, the first colony formed within the limits of the State at present bearing that name, the suffrage was not limited to church members, but the interests of religion in the accepted form were sedulously guarded in its constitution. At the outset, in the New Haven Colony, the laws of Moses, "being neither typical, nor ceremonial,

nor having any reference to Canaan," were provisionally adopted as the civil code, "till they be branched into particulars." One consequence was that the English laws of entail and primogeniture were avoided. Another result was that the number of capital offences, which, at that time, in England was thirty-one, and, according to Mackintosh, came to be, in 1819, two hundred and twenty-three, was at once reduced to twelve. In all the colonies, except Rhode Island, it was made the right and duty of the government to interfere for the remedy of grave abuses in the conduct and management of churches, and for the repression of heresy and schism. The Puritan founders were not, and never pretended to be, the advocates of universal toleration. They came into the wilderness because they saw no prospect that England would conform its ecclesiastical system to their view of the true principles of Protestantism and of the doctrine of the Scriptures, and they were bent on framing institutions corresponding to this view. At that time no political community existed in which religious liberty was recognized, and it was no part of the design of the Puritans to frame one.

While the local church was held to be a distinct ecclesiastical body, a relation of fellowship in religious activities and functions between the several churches in a community was deemed obligatory, and was formulated by a synod representing the churches of the four confederate colonies, which met at Cambridge, and in 1648 made the "Cambridge platform." The danger at that time was from attempts to establish Presbyterianism in England and its dependencies. There was a faction in New England in sympathy with these attempts. The Cambridge synod substituted for the authoritative church assemblies which belong to the Presbyterian system, councils which are only empowered to give advice and, in extreme cases, to recommend to the churches a renunciation of fellowship with any one of them that is chargeable with grave error or misconduct, and is incorrigible by fraternal expostulation. The union between the Connecticut and the New Haven Colonies was consummated in 1665. In 1708 a synod of the "elders and messengers" of the churches of the united community was held at Saybrook. There a form of Congregationalism, midway between the system of the Cambridge platform and Presbyterianism, was constituted, and was approved by the government, under whose auspices the synod had been assembled. Consociations, or permanent councils, composed of ministers and delegates, were created within each of the districts into which the colony was divided. But as to the amount of au-

The Congregational system.

thority possessed by these local bodies, there was a difference of opinion. Some held that their decisions were final, and others that they were only advisory. The consociational system was gradually weakened in process of time, and the tendency since the beginning of this century has been for the ecclesiastical system of the Congregational churches of Connecticut to assimilate itself to that set forth in the Cambridge platform.

The assembling of the Long Parliament, in 1640, stopped the tide of emigration to the Puritan colonies. At that time, or ten years after the migration of Winthrop and his company, more than twenty thousand Englishmen had planted themselves in New England. Among them were about eighty ministers, not less than one-half of whom were graduates of Cambridge or Oxford. Among them were divines of conspicuous ability, like John Cotton and Thomas Hooker, who had achieved, or were capable of achieving, celebrity in their native country. When the Westminster Assembly was about to be convened, a number of the New England ministers were urgently solicited to return to England, and to take part in reconstituting the English Church. They preferred, however, to prosecute the work which they had so auspiciously commenced in America.

Next to religion, education was valued by the Puritan settlers of New England. As early as 1636, in the midst of their struggles with penury, they established the college at Cambridge to which was afterwards attached the name of Harvard. Grammar schools, aided by the public, were soon founded, and in 1642 and 1643 common schools were begun in Massachusetts and Connecticut. Efforts to evangelize the Indians were earnestly made, and with no inconsiderable degree of success. The man most venerated in connection with such efforts is John Eliot. Eliot (1604-1690), who was a minister in Roxbury, but devoted his energies largely to the conversion and religious training of the natives. Settlements of "praying Indians" were formed at Natick and in other places. Twenty-four of his converts became preachers to the native tribes. He was not less noted for his kindness and profuse liberality than for his evangelical zeal. The principal monument of his labors is the translation of the Bible into the Indian language.

The New England Puritans in their ecclesiastical customs made a protest, in the most emphatic and practical forms, against sacerdotalism in the Church. Marriage, in the earlier days, was solemnized by the civil magistrate without the par-

Character of
the ministers.

Education in
New England.

Eliot.

Puritan wor-
ship.

ticipation of a clergyman. The dead were buried in unconsecrated ground, and without prayer or any other religious rite. Whatever was thought to savor of "will-worship," or was considered a human invention, having no sanction in the Bible, was discarded. The fasts and feasts of the Christian year which could not plead an express warrant of Scripture were abolished. Days of fasting or of thanksgiving were specially appointed, from time to time, by the magistrates. The custom was established of appointing by public proclamation an annual autumn festival of thanksgiving, and a fast-day in the spring. Instrumental music was not allowed in the "meeting-houses," as the places of public worship were termed, nor anywhere in religious services. Even the reading of the Bible was not permitted in public worship, unless it were accompanied with exposition. The Lord's Day was strictly kept as a Sabbath, according to the Puritan view that its observance was enjoined in the decalogue. The Sabbath extended from the sunset of Saturday to the sunset of Sunday, according to the Jewish method of reckoning days. As among Calvinists generally, and the Puritans especially, the Old Testament was studied with an absorbing interest and reverence. There was not generally a clear or consistent view of Revelation as a gradually developing system, the higher and final stage of which is the gospel.

The early penal codes of New England have often been denounced as remarkably severe for that age. This is an erroneous impression, as anyone may see who will look at the contemporaneous English laws, which in the long list of capital offences included larceny above the value of twelve pence, and punished various minor transgressions with branding. The false impression respecting the exceptional harshness of the Puritan codes has been derived partly from the apocryphal "Blue Laws," which were published in 1781, in a "History of Connecticut," an odd medley of fact and fiction, of which Samuel Peters, a mendacious refugee from that colony, was the author. These fictitious statutes, the invention of Peters, have been quoted as genuine by not a few respectable writers, even in recent times. It is only just to remark that the laws in New England did not exceed in rigor the statutes in force in other American colonies. In Maryland, an assembly, composed of Roman Catholics and Protestants, in 1649 passed a law against blasphemy, a crime which included the denial of the doctrine of the trinity or the use of any reproachful words respecting it. For the second offence, the penalty was branding on the forehead, and, for the third offence,

death and the confiscation of goods. In New York, under the government of the Dutch, cases are on record in which torture was used to elicit confessions. No other code in those days was so severe as that adopted in 1610 and 1611 for Virginia. It was ordained that one guilty of blasphemy for the second time should "have a bodkin thrust through his tongue." Laws requiring attendance on public worship existed at that time in old England as well as in New England. The penalties imposed on transgressors of like enactments were more severe in Virginia than in the Puritan colonies. The following statements are from the pen of Jefferson, in his "Notes on Virginia:" "The first settlers [of Virginia] were emigrants from England of the English Church, just at a point of time when it was flushed with complete victory over the religions of all other persuasions. Possessed, as they became, of the powers of making, administering, and executing the laws, they showed equal intolerance in this country with their Presbyterian [i.e., Congregationalist] brethren who had emigrated to the northern government. . . . Several acts of the Virginia Assembly of 1659, 1662, and 1693, had made it penal in parents to refuse to have their children baptized; had prohibited the unlawful assembling of Quakers; had made it penal for any master of a vessel to bring a Quaker into the State; had ordered those already here, and such as should come thereafter, to be imprisoned until they should abjure the country—provided a milder penalty for the first and second return, but *death* for the third. If no capital executions took place here, as [there] did in New England, it was not owing to the moderation of the Church, or the spirit of the legislature, as may be inferred from the law itself; but to historical circumstances, which have not been handed down to us." The foregoing statements of Jefferson should be qualified by the remark that the enforcement of uniformity in Virginia varied with the fluctuations of party in England, and that for long intervals the spirit of intolerance was dormant.

The alleged intolerance of the Massachusetts Colony has given rise to much sincere regret, and to no small amount of not very intelligent declamation. It is true that danger to the State has been the ordinary pretext for the exercise of coercion against religious dissent. But the distinction between a colony and a full-fledged commonwealth ought to be remembered. Things may be proper and even requisite in an infant settlement, midway between a family and a state, which are needless, as well as unjust, in a mature community. A spirit of exclusion may be at least a venial offence,

if not a necessity, in the one, which would be a grievous wrong in the other. Churches, in the view of almost all Protestants at that time, were national, or territorial. The Massachusetts colonists felt at liberty to organize Church and State to suit their own views. At the very beginning, in 1629, two persons, named Browne, protested against the form given to the church at Salem, and set up a separate worship, using the Prayer Book. Refusing to yield, they were shipped back to England. The position of the colonists was surely a trying one. "A conventicle of a score of persons using the liturgy might be harmless; but how long would the conventicle be without its surpliced priest, and when he had come, how far in the distance would be a bishop, armed with the powers of the High Commission Court?"

In 1631 Roger Williams arrived in Massachusetts. He was then about thirty years of age, was a graduate of Cambridge, and had probably taken orders. He had become, nevertheless, an Independent of an advanced type. He was a man of marked ability, and of a generous, disinterested spirit. His religious sincerity no one who knew him ever had reason to doubt. It must be admitted, also, that he was restless, contentious, and precipitate in judgment and action. The fact of capital importance in considering the controversy which led to his expulsion from the colony, is that he was a separatist of the most radical school, holding a position quite as extreme as that of Barrowe, and of Robinson in his earlier days. The first step he took was to refuse to officiate as a minister in Boston, because the church had not publicly renounced fellowship with the English Church, which he regarded as antichristian. He maintained that it was a sin to hear the parish ministers in England preach, since it implied fellowship with a corrupt, prelatical church, and that the New England Christians were bound to repent for not wholly breaking off communion with it while they were in England. Next, he wrote a treatise denying the right of the King of England to grant the patent on which the government of the colony rested. The patent, he affirmed, ought to be sent back. Another opinion which he proclaimed was that the cross ought not to be allowed in the royal ensign; and Endicott, at Salem, where Williams had been chosen as teacher of the church, was persuaded to cut it out of the colors. With the motives of this act many felt a sympathy, who nevertheless looked on it as in the highest degree inexpedient and dangerous. Williams, moreover, denied the moral lawfulness of administering an oath to the non-freemen of the colony who did not profess to be con-

Roger Williams.

verted. He added to this declaration the general doctrine that a government has no right to punish violations of the first table of the law—under which were included perjury and blasphemy as well as Sabbath-breaking—except where civil disturbances result from such practices. The sincerity and eloquence of the young preacher won for him disciples, especially in Salem, where a majority of the church were ready to follow him. The leaders of the colony believed that the entire social fabric which they had begun to erect was in danger of being overturned by internal dissension, and by the interference which the principles and measures urged by Williams would inevitably provoke at the hands of the authorities in England. They were suspicious of the colony, and needed only a plausible pretext for taking away the self-government which it had quietly assumed on the foundation of its charter as a trading corporation. Hence the colonists exercised the privilege, which in common with the other colonial communities they exercised on other occasions, of requiring him to depart. He was not even a freeman of the colony, not having taken the oath which admitted him to its franchise. In order to prevent them from sending him back to England, he fled, journeyed through the forests, and founded a settlement which, in token of gratitude, he named Providence.

Grounds of his banishment. The main grounds of his banishment, as he himself states, were his extreme views on the subject of separation and his denunciation of the patent. The statements of his adversaries, which do not differ essentially from his own testimony, make it plain that the reasons for his expulsion were, first, his attack on the patent, and secondly, his condemnation of the oath, as implying Christian fellowship with the unregenerate. The threatening attitude of the English Government had suggested to the magistrates the need of demanding an assurance of loyalty from all the inhabitants of the little community. The theory relative to the restricted function of the magistrate, or the doctrine of religious liberty, was a subordinate motive in the banishment of Williams, and it has no prominence in his own account of the matter. In a dangerous crisis in the situation of the colony, his presence was felt to involve great peril, in view, especially, of his "turbulent" opposition to the patent and to the oath. Williams would be styled, in modern parlance, a *doctrinaire* in politics. His doctrine of the rights of conscience would not of itself have produced his expulsion; yet to the assertion of this doctrine as it ripened in his mind to a definite form, and to the realization of it in a new political community, where not toleration but full religious liberty was incor-

porated in the fundamental law, he owes his distinction in history. His subsequent career evinced both the magnanimity and benevolence of his heart and the restless activity and controversial habit of his intellect. At Providence, in 1639, a layman named Holliman baptized him by immersion, and then Williams in turn baptized Holliman, and "some ten more." This was not a strange step, for Roger Williams had been anticipated in his favorite tenet of "soul-liberty" by the Baptists, who were pioneers in the assertion of the doctrine of religious freedom. But he soon withdrew from the Baptists. He stood aloof, in the closing years of his life, from all church fellowship. He discarded the rite of baptism altogether, and waited for a revived spiritual apostolate. Like his friend Vane, and others of like temperament, he became one of the "Seekers" who looked for a new heaven and a new earth. He had separated from the Massachusetts churches for recognizing in any way the parish churches of England; he had separated from his own church at Salem for not renouncing communion with the other Massachusetts churches; and at last he sundered fellowship with the Baptist church of his own formation and from all other organized Christian bodies. Yet through all these differences he carried an unruffled sweetness of temper, wrote and discussed in a truly Christian spirit, and by his genius, his services even to the colonies who cast him out, whom he befriended at the risk of his life, and by what he did for the cause of freedom, he is entitled to the noble place which he holds in American history.

In the ferment of the times, when England was on the verge of an ecclesiastical and political revolution, it was natural that persons deeply interested in new ideas in religion should set sail for the Puritan colony. A far more serious disturbance than was produced by the crusade of Roger Williams against the royal ensign and the patent, resulted from the arrival in Boston, in 1634, of Mrs. Ann Hutchinson. She was a woman of superior talents, who had been an admiring parishioner of Cotton in England. After establishing herself in Boston, she held, twice in the week, meetings of women in her own house for the discussion of the sermons which they heard in the church. Soon the whole community was alive with excitement on account of her novel opinions and her free comments on the teaching of the clergy. She had indicated what her views were to fellow-passengers on the voyage from England, and now brought them out more distinctly. She held that the Holy Spirit is personally united with the soul of

His later
career.

Ann Hutch-
inson.

every true Christian in such a way that his holiness is identified with the holiness of the Spirit, and that justification is not proved by sanctification, but rather is the acceptance of the believer assured by a more immediate testimony or inward revelation. She accused the ministers, with the exception of Cotton and her brother-in-law, Wheelwright, of preaching a "covenant of works" instead of the "covenant of grace," or, in a word, of being legalists. Her doctrine was denounced as Antinomian, but it was not charged that immoral consequences had been drawn from it by herself or her followers. In accord with the mystical and subjective drift of her theology, she embraced the opinion that the resurrection is not of the body, but is the rising of the soul to a new spiritual life, through its union to Christ, and that it takes place, therefore, at conversion. Vane, the young governor, and some other persons of influence, were in sympathy with her, and Cotton himself, the teacher of the Boston church, at first made no opposition to her tenets. So high did the excitement run that Wheelwright preached a vehement sermon on her side, which was judged by the other party and by the magistrates to be seditious in its character, and even to threaten violence. But her adversaries were much too strong for her supporters, who were mostly confined to Boston, and she was banished. Previously, at her examination by the ministers in the church, in which John Davenport, soon to be the founder of New Haven, took part, she partially retracted her expressions in regard to the resurrection; but the charge of mendacity, based, it is reasonable to believe, on nothing more than a pardonable confusion of memory on her part, was added to the accusations of heresy, and she was excommunicated. The clergy saw in her notions a revival of the loose ideas ascribed to the Familists. But it is plain that, besides the sincere belief of her clerical judges that her opinions would lead to immorality, and the offence given by her alleged contempt shown to the magistrates, her disesteem of the ministers, whom she was accused of denouncing as "nobodies," had much to do with her condemnation. She went at first to Rhode Island, where it is stated that she affirmed the unlawfulness of a civil magistracy. From there she went into the territory of the Dutch, where, in 1643, she, with her whole family, was murdered by the Indians. In Massachusetts the victory of the conservatives was complete. Vane was superseded by Winthrop as governor, and returned to England. The anarchy which they feared from attacks upon the clergy and their teaching by the clever woman who had secured the support of a majority of the

Boston church, was escaped. It deserves to be recorded that in the heat of the conflict some of her allies had actually threatened an appeal to the king against the local authorities, which would have been a blow at the independence, if not the existence, of the infant commonwealth.

The trouble with the Quakers is a third chapter in the history of the conflict of the Massachusetts colony with dissenters coming from abroad. The grotesque behavior and the fanatical extravagances of many of the early disciples of Fox had created among the Puritans an impression which is set forth in the law against them passed by the General Court of Massachusetts in 1657, wherein they are described as the "cursed sect of heretics lately risen up in the world, which are commonly called Quakers, who take upon them to be immediately sent of God, and infallibly assisted by the Spirit to speak and write blasphemous opinions, despising government and the order of God in church and commonwealth, speaking evil of dignities, reproaching and reviling magistrates and ministers, seeking to turn the people from the faith, and gain proselytes to their pernicious ways." Before the coming of the Quakers, the notoriety which they had gained by their disorderly proceedings elsewhere filled the colonists with alarm. The commissioners of the four colonies recommended the general courts to enact the laws which Massachusetts—the colony always most exposed to the incursions of sectaries, and most in peril from the precarious character of its government under the charter—proceeded to frame. The dread of what might follow from the coming of "Ranters and Quakers," whose doings were regarded as of a piece with those of the wild, anarchical Münsterites of Germany, caused a day of public humiliation and prayer to be held. The statute making it a capital offence for banished Quakers to return to the colony was, however, much opposed, and passed the house of deputies by only one majority. No doubt it was thought that the law would inspire such terror as would prevent anyone from exposing himself to its penalty. The law was unjust and unwise, although it is unquestionably the legal right of a civil community to exclude any class of obnoxious immigrants coming into its territory. A law of the same tenor, making it a capital offence for a Quaker to come back for the third time, was passed, in 1660, in the Episcopalian colony of Virginia. There the penalty of entertaining a Quaker in a man's house, to preach or to teach, was five hundred pounds of tobacco. In New Amsterdam [New York], at about the same time, Quakers were imprisoned,

The Quakers
in Massachu-
setts.

whipped, and banished. But in Massachusetts they insisted on returning the second and the third time ; and, it is lamentable to relate, several of them were hanged. It was soon perceived that measures so extreme were as ineffectual as they were cruel, and they were abandoned. "At first," says Palfrey, "after the discontinuance of capital punishment, the antics of the Quakers became more absurd than before. Far and near, they disturbed the congregations at their worship." One young woman walked through the town of Salem, naked, "as a sign," and another entered, stark naked, the meeting-house at Newbury, "as a sign to them"—that is, to the church at that place. Such developments of half-insane enthusiasm were confined, it is needless to say, to the earliest stage in the history of the Society of Friends, which has rendered invaluable services to the cause of religion and morality.

The first settlers of Virginia were Episcopalians, with no taint of disaffection towards the Established Church of England. Among them were several ministers of godly lives. One of the first emigrants, and the first to hold public worship at Jamestown, was Robert Hunt, described as a "religious and courageous divine." The company which came over with him was made up of men without families, and had in it forty-eight gentlemen to four carpenters. Its character was such that the clergyman had a hard task to perform. But, at the outset, he read prayers and preached under a roof of canvas. After a time a small building was erected for common worship. We read that after the arrival of Lord Delaware, in 1610, "the little church was kept neatly trimmed with the wild flowers of the country." Another clergyman who was honorably distinguished in the early annals of the Virginia Colony was Alexander Whitaker, by whom Pocahontas was baptized. The colonists were warned by the patentees to avoid the "novelties" of Puritanism. In 1619 delegates from the eleven plantations met in an assembly. The Church of England was confirmed as the established church of the colony. All persons were required by law to attend church in the morning and afternoon. There was a plan for the erection of a college at Henrico, and of a school for the education of Indian youth. Much interest was felt in the project in England, and liberal contributions were made. But the character of the colony was weakened by sending over large numbers of outcasts and felons. In March, 1622, there was a great Indian massacre. These things reduced the number of the inhabitants from four thousand to twenty-five hundred. The plans for the educational institutions were given up.

The Church
in Virginia.

In 1624 there were but four resident clergymen in the colony, only one of whom was bred at a university. The administration of the laws against dissent was milder than the laws themselves. Puritans found their way into the country. At the beginning of the civil war in England, there were members of the council who favored nonconformity. There were invitations sent by some to Puritan ministers in Boston to come into the colony. But the governor, Sir William Berkeley, was hostile to nonconformists. In 1643 conformity "to the order and constitution of the Church of England" was required of all ministers. The governor and council were to take care that "all nonconformists upon notice to them shall be compelled to depart out of the colony with all convenience." Some of the pastors of the Independents were fined, others were imprisoned. Nearly all were driven away. Reference has already been made to the treatment of Quakers by the Virginia government. Baptists were stigmatized as "schismatical persons, filled with the new-fangled conceits of their heretical inventions." All who refused to carry their children to a "lawful minister" to have them baptized were to "be amerced two thousand pounds of tobacco."

In New England there was a division of the people into towns, each with a distinct political organization. The congregation of the town, or of the parish when the town was so large that there was more than one place of worship, acted concurrently with the church in the choice and dismissal of ministers. It was the congregation, or "society," which held the property, and paid the assessments for the support of religious services. It stood somewhat in the relation of patron to the church or the body of communicants. In Virginia, the planters lived by themselves on their large estates. The "vestry" exercised the function, which belonged in New England to the congregation and the church.

The two colonial settlements of Rhode Island were united under the charter obtained by Roger Williams in 1643. Rhode Island was a place of refuge for all disaffected or banished inhabitants of the neighboring colonies. The disorders that existed there were not greater than might have been expected, in view of this circumstance, and of the unrestricted freedom of its polity. The inhospitable reception afforded to the Baptists in Massachusetts contributed to the growth of the community founded by Williams, where they became numerous. For a like reason, the Society of Friends grew in numbers there.

The "congregation:" the vestry.

Rhode Island.

The Middle Atlantic coast, between Virginia and Connecticut, was occupied by other settlements. The Dutch brought with them to New Netherland the doctrine and polity of the New York.

Reformed Church as it existed in their native country. They manifested that concern for the cause of religion and of education which was characteristic of the countrymen of William the Silent. Their Calvinism was as strict as was the creed of their New England brethren; but they were somewhat less austere in their views of the Christian life, and from the situation of their colony they were less exposed to perils which were adapted to provoke an exclusive or intolerant policy. Refugees from Connecticut and Massachusetts, like Mrs. Hutchinson, were permitted to reside within their bounds. Yet a different spirit sometimes prevailed. When Stuyvesant was lord director, Lutherans were prohibited by law from holding worship according to their own forms. In 1656 it was ordained that all parishes should be forbidden to hold conventicles not in harmony with the established religion as set forth by the Synod of Dort. Fines were imposed on every preacher who broke this law, and on everyone who should attend a meeting thus prohibited. But the directors of the company at Amsterdam rebuked the "over-preciseness" of Stuyvesant, and hindered the pursuance of this narrow course. Among other reasons, it was perceived that such intolerance would stand in the way of immigration. Against the Quakers there was an outbreak of hostility. As in Massachusetts, a day of fasting and prayer was observed on account of the evils which it was feared that their coming would bring upon the colony. After the conquest of New Amsterdam by the English, the Episcopal Church was established by law. It was ordained in 1693 that all the inhabitants should be taxed for the support of the ministry and for the building of churches. It was found impracticable, however, to carry out strictly or uniformly this requirement. In 1674 it was ordained that "all persons, of what religion soever," should be treated alike. Jews were not allowed to serve as soldiers, but in other respects they stood on a level with the rest of the colonists. The relations between the Dutch ministers and the English Episcopal ministers were often of a friendly and fraternal character.

The first Lord Baltimore, the founder of Maryland, was one of the secretaries of state under James I., and supported his despotic measures of government. He joined the Roman Catholic Church, but was not inclined to an intolerant treatment of Protestants. The second Lord Baltimore, under whose di-

Maryland.

rection Maryland was settled, was of the same liberal turn. The colony was designed as a place of refuge for Roman Catholics, but a great part of the first colonists were Protestants, and it was stipulated in the grant of the king that the religion of the Church of England should be protected. Both from inclination and from policy, full religious liberty was established by the founders. The Puritan element in the colony gradually became strong, and allied itself with Claiborne, a Virginian who had been dispossessed, by the Maryland proprietary, of the island which he had held in the Chesapeake. The sympathies of Baltimore were naturally rather with the king than with the Parliament, and under the Commonwealth the Parliamentary Commissioners, in 1652, deposed his officers, and placed the government of the province in the hands of a Puritan council. The Catholics were even disfranchised. These troubles ended in a civil war in 1655, in which the Catholics were worsted ; but five years later the old liberties were restored. At the Revolution of 1688, the failure of Baltimore to give in his adhesion to William and Mary brought on a revolt and revolution in the colony, in which he was deprived of his authority. The Episcopal Church was now established, and civil disabilities were imposed on the Roman Catholics.

In 1681, William Penn, in consideration of a debt due from the government of England to his father, an admiral in the British Navy, received from Charles II. a grant of the territory called Pennsylvania, which he was to possess, under the king, as proprietor and ruler. The next year Philadelphia was founded. Penn's primary motive in seeking for such a place of settlement was to provide an asylum for persecuted Christians of his own faith. He allowed the Dutch and Swedes on the west of the Delaware to retain their lands. The Swedes had settled there in 1638, and surrendered to the Dutch in 1655. The Swedish settlements had been formed in pursuance of a purpose of Gustavus Adolphus to plant a colony, which was carried out under the auspices of Oxenstiern. After the Dutch conquest, they were subject to Holland until the surrender of New Netherland to the English, in 1664. Penn established freedom and equality of rights in all matters of religion. By his fair treatment of the Indians he laid the foundation of a lasting peace. He thus was enabled to attract emigrants, in large numbers, from various religious bodies besides that of which he was the honored leader.

The founders of Maryland deserve credit for their tolerant temper. In that period, however, for an English colony of Roman

Catholics to exclude or persecute Protestants would have been impossible. Penn was a sincere advocate of religious liberty ; but his colonizing enterprise was two generations later than the settlements in New England and Virginia. It is Rhode Island that is especially distinguished for the early and full incorporation of religious freedom in the framework of civil polity. But, at some time after the English Revolution of 1688, a law in Rhode Island was passed forbidding Roman Catholics to vote.

We return to New England to notice the witchcraft delusion, a painful chapter of history, which belongs later than the close of this period, but earlier than the end of the century. At that time there was a universal belief in the reality of witchcraft, which everywhere in Christendom was punished as a crime. Magic, as the word imports—which is derived from the name given to the Persian priesthood—is of Oriental birth. It properly signifies the use of the aid of supernatural beings, or of occult, powerful forces in nature, for the purpose of foretelling the future, or of bringing good or evil on living beings, men or animals. Magic and necromancy were forbidden in the Hebrew laws, as being identified with the idolatrous beliefs and practices of the heathen. In the unrest and infidelity which were prevalent in the Roman Empire when Christianity appeared, there was an open door for credulity and superstition to enter. The East and the West were brought together, and numerous professional magicians and dealers in the preternatural were roving in all parts of the Roman world, with whom, as we see from the Book of Acts, the first preachers of the gospel frequently came in contact. By Christians the heathen gods were considered to be evil demons. The increase of the popular faith in diabolical agency of all sorts, in the middle ages, is one of the characteristic features of that period. Yet, from the sixth to the twelfth century, there was comparatively little persecution based on alleged compacts with Satan. This circumstance has been explained by the persuasion then current that Satan could be instantly driven away or disarmed by talismans, or the repetition of a few holy words. But after the twelfth century, and to the end of the century that followed the Reformation, death was inflicted in numberless instances on the alleged confederates of the evil one. It is supposed that prior to the witchcraft epidemic in Massachusetts, thirty thousand persons had been put to death in England on this charge, seventy-five thousand in France, and a hundred thousand in Germany.

Before 1692 twelve persons had been executed in New Eng-

The witch-
craft delu-
sion.

land on this charge of witchcraft. In the summer of 1692, when the trials took place at Salem (now Danvers Centre), nineteen persons suffered the same fate. It is not true that the ministers were the prime instigators of these proceedings, which were conducted by a special court constituted for the purpose. Increase Mather and his son, Cotton Mather, were prominent ministers who believed in the reality of witchcraft and wrote on the subject; but they were not active in promoting the trials. On the contrary, it is only just to say that their influence was rather sedative than stimulating, in this brief period of superstitious excitement. Increase Mather's discovery that the accusers, rather than the accused, might be the real victims of the arts of Satan did much to put an end to the prosecutions. There had been a strong feeling against them, and there ensued a reaction which led almost all the prominent actors in the tragic drama to repent most sincerely of the way in which they had been misled. The whole community shared in this feeling of shame and contrition.

Yet the persecution of the witches in Massachusetts was not in the least at variance with the convictions, or revolting to the humanity, of the best men of the time in other countries.

Prevalence of
the belief in
witchcraft.

The same opinion was still cherished that lay at the basis of the bull of Pope Innocent VIII., in 1484, in which he complained that even then there were "some Sadducees in the Church, who threw obstacles as far as they dared" in the way of the punishment of witches and wizards, and which inspired Bishop Jewel's sermon before Queen Elizabeth on the dangerous prevalence of such offences. In 1681, only eleven years before the Salem tragedy, Henry More, the genial Oxford Platonist, published, with an accompanying letter, Glanvil's "Sadduceeism Conquered." More praises the wisdom of Providence in providing a practical confutation of "Hobbians and Spinozians and the rest of that rabble" who disbelieve in angels and spirits, by giving "ever and anon such fresh examples of apparitions and witchcrafts as may rub up and awaken their benumbed and lethargic minds into a suspicion at least that there are other intelligent beings besides these that are clad in heavy earth or clay." So strongly moved is this usually mild writer at the course taken by the wanton and arrogant disbelievers in witchcraft, that he styles them contemptuously, "The small philosophic Sir Foplings of this present age," who "are as much afraid of these stories [of wizards and witches] as an ape is of a whip."

More remarkable still is the tone of the author whom the pref-

ace just quoted introduces. Glanvil was one of the earliest members elected to the Royal Society. He was a warm champion of the experimental philosophy. His "*Skepsis Scientifica*" is a vigorous attack upon the Aristotelian system and upon its founder, and a zealous plea for the Baconian method. In philosophy he is counted among the advanced men of that day. But he trembled for religion if the belief in witches and apparitions were allowed to be assailed with impunity. "Those," he says, "that dare not bluntly say there is no God, content themselves (for a fair step and introduction) to deny there are spirits or witches." They comprise "most of the looser gentry, and the small pretenders to philosophy and wit:" "atheism is begun in Sadducism." In support of the proposition that there have been unlawful confederacies with evil spirits, "by virtue of which the hellish accomplices perform things above their natural powers," Glanvil appeals to all histories, which abound in the exploits of the instruments of darkness; to thousands of eye- and ear-witnesses, some of them discerning and grave, and having no interest to contrive a lie; to standing public records; to the laws of many nations; to the verdicts of wise and honored judges; to the fact that thousands in England had suffered death for their "vile compacts with apostate spirits." To reject this belief, supported by all this varied evidence, is "to make laws built upon chimeras," to hold that wise men are jugglers, that the gravest judges are murderers, and the "sagest persons, fools or designing impostors." After the theoretical discussion upon the nature of spirits, which involves the metaphysics of the matter, follow the proofs from Scripture, extending from the record of the magicians of Egypt down to the account of the demoniacs of the New Testament. An elaborate examination of the narrative of the Witch of Endor takes into view the different solutions which ignore diabolic agency in that transaction. These are denounced as untenable and rationalistic evasions of clear statements of Scripture. The concluding portion of the volume presents a copious "collection of Relations"—facts going to verify, beyond all reasonable dispute, the reality of witchcraft.

Glanvil's work displays the views which had long been current. Richard Baxter published narratives of witchcraft which he had received from Cotton Mather, and pronounced that man "an obdurate Sadducee" who was not convinced by these irresistible proofs. In his later work, on "*The Certainty of the World of Spirits*," he reiterated the same judgment, which is expressed in other places in his writings. The friend of Baxter, Sir Matthew

Hale, sent witches to the scaffold. "That there were such creatures as witches," he said to a jury, "he made no doubt at all." In the trial in which he spoke thus, so liberal-minded a man as Sir Thomas Browne, a physician and the author of the "*Religio Medici*," expressed to the court his opinion, which carried great weight, that the prisoners were guilty. That prodigy of learning, Ralph Cudworth, one of the foremost of English philosophical theologians, asserts that the evidence of the reality of these dark confederacies between men and devils is so great, both from Scripture and human testimony, that disbelievers, "in this present age, can hardly escape the suspicion of having some hankering towards atheism." John Wesley, as late as 1768, utters his "solemn protest" against conceding to enemies of the Bible the unreality of witchcraft. "They well know," he says, "whether Christians know it or not, that the giving up of witchcraft is in effect giving up the Bible." Nor, even at so late a time, do such professions of faith come from the clergy exclusively. Blackstone published his "*Commentaries on the Laws of England*" in 1765-69, or at just about the date when Wesley wrote the passage quoted above. In this work Blackstone asserts that "to deny the possibility, nay, actual existence of witchcraft and sorcery, is at once flatly to contradict the revealed Word of God in various passages both of the Old and New Testament."

In New England, in the closing decades of the seventeenth century, there were special reasons why such a delusion might naturally arise. It is perfectly in keeping with the Puritan opinion of that day for Cotton Mather to say: "The devils have doubtless felt a more than ordinary vexation from the arrival of those Christians, with their sacred exercises of Christianity, in this wilderness; but the sovereignty of heaven has permitted them still to remain in the wilderness, for our vexation as well as their own." The scape-goat was sent to Azazel in the desert. Regions of this kind were favorite haunts of devils. The arrival of the Puritan emigrants was an invasion of them in their own abodes. This is certain, that the idea of the New England settlers that Satan had a special hostility to their enterprise was sanctioned by English Puritan divines of the highest repute. The gloomy experience of Indian wars, and of the terror engendered by them, and even the physical aspect of the country, with its deep solitudes and vast, unbroken forests, might easily affect the imagination of the colonists, in whom these ideas relative to Satan were deeply planted.

The belief in witchcraft gradually passed away. The advance

of inductive science accounted by natural causes for occurrences once considered preternatural, and excluded diabolic agency from the field of material phenomena. Witches and wizards, with their compacts with the devil, signed in blood, the midnight convocations, the careering through the air on broomsticks, the tortures inflicted by apparitions, the *incubi* and *succubi*, have been banished to the realm of fable. In behalf of the reality of witchcraft, a vast array of authorities can be adduced from the records of the past. What the actual proofs were on which the prevailing opinion rested is another question. As regards a certain class of the phenomena—strange experiences which cannot be explained by the supposition of fraud—much light is thrown by recent studies respecting hysteria, hystero-epilepsy, and hypnotism. Hallucination enables us to solve much that was once unaccountable. As regards the prodigies of a more grotesque character and miraculous aspect, the recorded evidence for them, when it is sifted, is not found by careful students to be of much strength. Lecky in the interesting chapter on this subject, in his “History of Rationalism in Europe,” does not take account of the distinction in the weight of evidence for the two classes of phenomena, relatively considered.

PERIOD IX.

FROM THE PEACE OF WESTPHALIA TO THE PRESENT TIME (1648-1887).

CHANGES AND CONFLICTS CONSEQUENT ON A NEW ERA IN
CULTURE AND SCIENCE: SOCIAL REFORM: A NEW
STAGE OF MISSIONARY CONQUEST.

CHAPTER I.

ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS IN THE LAST HALF OF THE SEVEN- TEENTH CENTURY.

Religion in
England under the Com-
monwealth.

AFTER the downfall of the English monarchy and the execution of Charles I., the Independents, of whom Cromwell was the chief, attained to supreme power in the State. He was more favorable to religious liberty than most of his contemporaries, including even the members of his own sect. "Is it ingenuous," he said, "to ask for liberty and not to give it?" Under the Commonwealth, however, Roman Catholics were deprived of the privilege of voting or holding office. The use of the Prayer Book was forbidden. But whatever was done by the Protector against the Episcopal clergy, as Bishop Kennet said, was more on account of their being Royalists than because they were Churchmen. Presbyterianism was prevented from being fully established. A commission of "Triers" was constituted for the examination and approval of candidates for the ministry. There were Presbyterians and Baptists on this board, although a majority were Independents. Even Episcopalians were admitted to membership, notwithstanding the ordinance against the use of the Book of Common Prayer. Another commission was framed for the ejection of ministers whose lives were scandalous. Under Cromwell, religion was sustained and fostered by the State; the

ministry were supported by tithes ; but only to this extent can there be said to have been an established Church. The Protector declared that he would not suffer one Christian to trample on the heels of another, or to revile him. He withstood the efforts of Presbyterians to exercise rule, and rebuked Independents when they manifested a like temper. He wrote to Mazarin, the prime minister of France, that he had shown, and desired to show, all the indulgence to Catholics that the impediments in the way of such action would allow. Sir Henry Vane was a Republican, and refused to acquiesce in the dictatorship of Cromwell. He was in advance of the times in his advocacy of religious liberty, and in 1656 he published his "Healing Question," in which he set forth his ideas on this subject. The magistrate, he says, "is to be a minister of terror and revenge to those who do evil in matters of outward practice, converse, and dealings in the things of this life between man and man," but beyond this he has no right to go. Such views found little sympathy in any party. Episcopalians, prohibited from using their own book of devotion in public services, sometimes broke the law and used it in secret, sometimes held their services without using the formularies, and in some cases wrote prayers on the basis of those which they were forbidden to repeat. While this persecution is condemned, it must not be forgotten how closely religious differences were mingled with political aims. To be a "prelatist" was to be a foe to the government and to be anxious to overthrow it. The energy of the Protector gave to England a commanding influence abroad. "She was the head of the Protestant interest. All the reformed churches scattered over Roman Catholic kingdoms acknowledged Cromwell as their guardian." The Huguenots of Languedoc, says Macaulay, were rescued from oppression "by the mere terror of that great name. The pope himself was forced to preach humanity and moderation to popish princes ; for a voice which seldom threatened in vain had declared that unless favor were shown to the people of God, the English guns should be heard in the Castle of St. Angelo."

The English people, after Cromwell's death, were weary of the control of the army and yearned for the restoration of the monarchy. The Presbyterians had never been satisfied with the Protector's government. The common people missed their familiar festivals and sports, and disliked generally the strictness of the Puritan rule. In the bringing back of Charles II., the Presbyterians bore a prominent part. But too much reliance was placed on fair words, and no formal guarantees

Religion in
England under
Charles II.

were exacted of the good-natured, but immoral prince. Even had he been more disposed than he was to a moderate and liberal policy in matters of religion, the Anglican reaction, in which a long-smothered passion of loyalty was mingled with deep resentment against the party at whose hands Churchmen had suffered, would have prevented him from carrying out such an inclination. The influence of the able minister, Clarendon, was thrown on the side of arbitrary and intolerant measures. The Savoy Conference, in 1661, between twenty-one Anglican and as many Presbyterian divines, served only to bring out the unrelenting antagonism of the Episcopal party. They would make no concessions. An opportunity was lost for a comprehension which would have retained in the Established Church a great number of the best ministers in England, and have saved it from disasters and perils in store for it. The leading Presbyterians, like Baxter, would have been content with a moderate Episcopacy, after Ussher's model, in which the suffragan bishops should be increased in number, and each of them preside over a council of presbyters.

The Act of Uniformity. The Act of Uniformity, passed in 1662, required all ministers to receive Episcopal ordination and make a declaration of unfeigned assent and consent to the Prayer Book, and to the whole system of the Church of England. They were required, moreover, to take the oath of canonical obedience, to abjure the Solemn League and Covenant, and to abjure, also, the doctrine of the lawfulness of taking up arms against the king under any circumstances whatever. For declining to comply with these hard tests, two thousand godly ministers were in one day ejected from their livings. When a like measure was adopted by the Long Parliament against the Episcopal clergy, a fifth of their income had been given them as a provision for their instant necessities. In their case, moreover, a civil war was impending, in which they stood against the Parliament. The ministers cast out by the Act of Uniformity were loyal supporters of the monarchy, without whose cordial aid Charles II. would probably have remained an exile. The vengeance of the triumphant faction was eager in the pursuit of political offenders. Among them was Vane, whose life the king had promised to spare. Crowds of people on the house-tops and in the windows greeted him on his way to the scaffold. "The Lord go with you, the great God of heaven and earth appear in you and for you," was the shout that he heard. He responded by lifting his hat and bowing. His bearing to the end was noble and even cheerful. His last words were an expression

of thanks to God that he had been counted worthy to suffer. Episcopacy was forced on Scotland. After Cromwell's victory at Dunbar, Scotland had been virtually dependent upon England. The Scotch rejoiced in the accession of Charles, which, as they expected, would set them free. But the two ambassadors, Lauderdale and Sharp, whom they sent to London to secure the re-establishment of Presbyterianism, betrayed their cause. Sharp went home as Archbishop of St. Andrews. Lauderdale, by rescinding all statutes passed in the Parliament of 1640, and subsequently, restored the Episcopal system. Argyle, who had been most efficient in the restoration of Charles,

1662. but who was feared as well as hated for his previous course, was brought to the block on the charge of treason. A series of cruel measures completed the subjugation of Scotland. All public officers were required to abjure the Covenant. Episcopal ordination was imposed on all who had livings. The consequence of this measure was that three hundred and fifty ministers were driven from their places. A "Mile Act" forbade any recusant minister to reside within twenty miles of his parish or within three miles of a royal borough. A High Commission Court was established for the purpose of crushing all insubordination, in act or speech, against these church arrangements. Charles himself had no religious principles. His preferences were on the side of the Roman Catholic Church, to which, on his death-bed, he conformed. He wanted to govern with absolute authority, like Louis XIV. He would have been willing to grant indulgence, or dispense with laws in part, if by this favor to the nonconformists he could gain as much for the Roman Catholics. But the House of Commons would not lend its aid for the relief of either of the

The Conven-
ticle Act.

parties obnoxious to it. In 1664, the Conventicle Act was passed, which prohibited any religious meeting attended by more than five persons, except according to the practice of the Episcopal Church. Nonconformists in large numbers were lodged in the jails. The brave and generous conduct of this class during the great plague in London, in 1665, had no effect on the implacable faction that had the power in its hands. The Five Mile Act forbade any clergyman who had not subscribed to the Act of Uniformity to teach in schools or to come within five miles of any corporate town or Parliament borough. He must, moreover, swear to be loyal to the doctrine of passive obedience to the sovereign, and promise not to try to alter the government of Church and State. Clarendon became unpopular. The sale of Dunkirk to the

French awakened indignation. The naval victories of the Dutch over the English made this feeling a hundred-fold more intense. The Covenanters in Scotland rose in arms, and their spirit was not subdued by defeat. The debauchery of the court was regarded by all good men with profound disapprobation and disgust. In connection with hatred of Puritan austerities, the floodgates of profligacy were opened to a degree without example in English history. The diaries of Evelyn, a high-toned Royalist, and of Pepys, a competent witness, show to what a depth of degradation the morals of the king and his court had fallen. Vast sums of public money were diverted from the objects specified by Parliament in the appropriation of them. Clarendon, who had gratified neither Parliament nor the advocates of absolutism, was, in 1667, dismissed from office, impeached, and banished. The next year, subservience to France was exchanged for an alliance with Holland and Sweden. But this was a temporary, reluctant concession of

Secret treaty
with Louis
XIV.

Charles. In 1670 he formed a secret treaty with Louis XIV., by which it was agreed that at the fitting time Charles should avow himself a Roman Catholic, and, with the help of Louis, establish the Catholic religion and absolute government in England. In return, Charles was to help Louis in his designs on the Netherlands. In 1672, war was declared against Holland. Charles, before it commenced, had sought to conciliate dissenters by an illegal declaration of indulgence. Among the prisoners who were set free by this declaration was the most celebrated of English authors in the field of practical religion, the tinker of Elstow and the author of "Pilgrim's Progress," John Bunyan. His imprisonment, with a relaxation of confinement at intervals, had continued for twelve years. To secure the means of living for his blind child and the other members of his impoverished family, he learned to make long-tagged thread laces, and in Bedford jail had patiently labored at this employment. He wrote: "I have had sweet sights of the forgiveness of my sins in this place, and of my being with Jesus in another world. . . . I have seen that here which I am persuaded I shall never while in this world be able to express." His immortal work was written during a later imprisonment, which began three years after his release. Parliament obliged Charles to recall the Declaration of Indulgence, after victories gained by the Dutch, and passed the Test Act, requiring of all officials to partake of the sacrament in the Church of England, and to declare their disbelief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. The king's brother James, Duke of

York, who was a Roman Catholic, gave up his office of high admiral. Charles continued to be the vassal of France, except as he was thwarted and overruled by Parliament. The oppressions in Scotland led to the murder of Archbishop Sharp, one of the principal authors of them. In 1679, the Covenanters were defeated by Monmouth at Bothwell Bridge. Afterwards the Duke of York took his place, and practised cruelties to which the more lenient temper of Monmouth was not inclined.

James II., who began to reign in 1685, had the same purpose to govern according to an arbitrary system as his brother had cherished. He was more desirous to bring England back to allegiance to the Church of Rome, of which he was an open adherent. He was, however, not disposed to be the servant of France and her sovereign, unless the pressure of circumstances should drive him, under a choice of evils, to this humiliating position. The trial and conviction of Richard Baxter, and the scurrilous abuse heaped on him by Jeffreys, who sat on the bench, showed what treatment even the most religious and loyal of dissenters might expect. "Even men," writes Baxter, "that had been taken for sober and religious, when they had a mind for preferment and to be taken notice of at court, and by the prelates, did fall on preaching or writing against me." One after another of his clerical brethren died in Newgate. In recording this fact, he calmly says: "The prison, where so many are, suffocated the spirits of aged ministers; but blessed be God that gave them so long time to preach before, at cheaper rates." In Scotland a Parliament of Episcopalians, elected by Episcopalians alone, made the act of preaching at a conventicle under a roof, or being present at a conventicle in the open air, a capital offence. The cruelties practised on the Covenanters by Claverhouse and others, and the heroism of the sufferers, form a thrilling tale. One of the martyrs, Margaret Wilson, who was drowned at Solway Firth, when asked, as the waters closed about her, if she would abjure the Covenant, replied: "Never. I am Christ's; let me go." Gradually, James, by his zeal in behalf of his own religion, alienated his Episcopalian supporters in England. There was not only a brutal persecution of dissenters, but also an attempt, by legal machinery, to introduce Roman Catholics into English benefices. In 1686 the king re-established the Court of High Commission, and placed at its head the iniquitous Jeffreys. In Ireland he did his best to supersede in places of trust and influence English Protestants by Irish Catholics. In 1687 the king sought to win the support of Protestant non-

Persecution
under James.

conformists by an unlawful declaration of indulgence, which annulled penal laws and religious tests. It was ordered to be read in the churches. Seven bishops petitioned against being obliged to read in public an illegal declaration. Their petition got into print. Their arraignment on the charge of publishing a seditious libel called out general and enthusiastic expressions of sympathy for them. These were redoubled at the news of their acquittal. An invitation went over to William, Prince of Orange, who was the husband of Mary, the king's daughter, to bring an army into England and to deliver the nation from tyranny.

The Revolution of 1688.

A combination of parties, which was effected on account of the king's plain purpose to overthrow liberty in the State and to establish popery, produced the Revolution of 1688. James fled, the throne was declared vacant, and William and Mary acceded to power. The Act of Toleration exempted from the penalties of laws against conventicles such as should take the oath of allegiance and subscribe to the doctrinal portion of the Thirty-nine Articles. An indulgence was given to Quakers without this condition. Meeting-houses, if registered, were protected by law. This toleration was not extended to papists or to those who denied the Trinity.

In the middle of the seventeenth century a new element suddenly made its appearance in the religious life of England. In the midst of political contests and the debates of learned and argumentative divines, there occurred an outbreak of what was called, in the language of the time, "enthusiasm." The name continued to be given to whatever was, or was deemed to be, an extravagant claim to supernatural, divine influence, especially if it involved an intuition of divine things, or an exalted state of the emotions. Under the head of "enthusiasm" was included, not only zeal passing the ordinary or approved limit, but also whatever is now termed mysticism. The first manifestation of this type of religion was the rise of Quakerism.

The founder of the Quakers was George Fox. His father was a weaver at Drayton. By him the son was religiously trained. He was apprenticed to a shoemaker, who had, however, a variety of employments, and Fox spent much of his time in tending sheep for his master. In 1643 his mind was suddenly struck with the vanity of worldly pursuits and pleasures, and with the feeling that, literally as well as in spirit, he must "forsake all, both young and old." He accordingly left his relatives, and for several years wandered from place to place, for the most part avoiding society. In 1646 he began to have new revelations

Life and characteristics of Fox.

in his soul of the light and grace of the gospel, and in the following year he began his career as an itinerant preacher. In 1649, in a church at Nottingham, he felt moved to interrupt the preacher in the midst of the sermon, and to proclaim the need of an illumination from above for the understanding of the Bible and the ascertainment of divine truth. He was lodged in jail for this offence, and this brief detention was the beginning of a series of imprisonments for like disturbances. For a period of forty years Fox was active with pen and voice, travelling in England and Scotland, and visiting Holland and America. In 1656, the number of preachers whom he had associated with him as itinerant helpers was not less than fifty-six. He early adopted the peculiarities of attire and of speech that characterize the Quakers. This name was given them by their enemies. As to the precise origin of the appellation there are different accounts.

Fox was reinforced by two able men. One of them was the second founder of the Society of Friends, as they preferred to be called, William Penn. Penn was the son of a British Career of
William Penn. admiral. His family, after the fall of Cromwell, supported the Stuarts, and earned their favor. The charges against Penn which Macaulay made have been disproved. His career was an eventful one. He played an important and a useful part on both sides of the ocean. In 1667 he became a minister of the Quaker denomination, and from that time exerted the influence which wealth and high social station afforded him, in behalf of his persecuted brethren and in the dissemination of their tenets. By his agency in founding Pennsylvania, he added much to the strength and growth of the body of which he was so powerful a leader. He repeatedly suffered imprisonment for his opinions and for his consistency in carrying them into practice. He published pamphlets and treatises, of which "No Cross, no Crown," is the most valued. The most eminent writer among the Quakers was Robert Barclay. He was educated partly in Paris. His "Apology for the True Christian Divinity" is a work of more than common theological ability. It is an instructive exposition of the Quaker opinions.

The prime feature of the Quaker system is the doctrine of the inner light. It is the doctrine that the Holy Spirit not only opens Tenets of the
Quakers. to the mind the spiritual contents of the Scriptures, and creates a living conviction of their inspiration and of the reality of the gospel—so much, Protestants generally held—but also imparts truth supplementary to biblical teaching. This additional truth cannot contradict the Bible. Hence the Bible is the

umpire in controversies. In keeping with the general character of the system, the sacraments are discarded. The vocation to the ministry is an inward call, which may be given to a woman as well as to a man. A view not essentially different from the Arminian is adopted on the subject of original sin. Justification is gratuitous and is by faith, but is incomplete and void of benefit without the inward reception of Christ and a mystical union with him. Every soul has its time of visitation, when the Spirit comes to it with enlightening power, and, if not resisted, brings to it holiness and peace. The Quakers followed the letter of the Sermon on the Mount. War is pronounced to be in all cases unrighteous. It is considered wrong to take an oath. Simplicity in speech, as well as dress and manners, is inculcated.

Many converts were made by the Quaker preachers. The unseemly proceedings of some, especially in interrupting public worship and in denouncing the clergy, provoked against them measures of coercion. The convulsions and other physical manifestations which often followed upon the preaching of the Quakers excited opposition. But none of the extravagances into which many of the early Quakers fell, much less their refusal to pay tithes and to comply with other ecclesiastical demands, furnish an excuse for the merciless persecution which pursued these eccentric but devout Christians. They were shut up in pestilential cells. At one time, four thousand Quakers are said to have been in prison in England. Many of the early preachers died in prison. Women as well as men were attacked by savage mobs. Their meeting-houses were pulled down, sometimes by the order of the church authorities. Very heavy fines were extorted from them. In 1656, Quakers came to Massachusetts from the Barbadoes. Several of them, including one woman, under circumstances already stated, were hanged. In Virginia, and other colonies also, as we have seen, very severe laws were framed against them. In England it was not until the Declaration of Indulgence in 1687, by James II., that the long persecution of them came to an end. After that date, they simply shared in the disabilities which affected in common all dissenters. In process of time, their Christian temper and their active labors of philanthropy disarmed the prejudice which had been so bitter against them.

The Quakers were organized in "meetings," which were subordinate to one another, and had provisions for careful discipline. In their assemblies for worship the men and women sat apart. The congregation waited in silence for individuals to be "moved

Treatment of
the Quakers.

by the Spirit " to speak. For profitable utterance it was held that direct inspiration was needful.

After the death of Henry IV., the Huguenots in France were not infrequently subject to persecution. Their churches were

Persecution
of the Hu-
guenots.

kept in a state of agitation and alarm. In 1621, there was a rising of Huguenots, which was put down; but

Montauban and Rochelle were still left in their possession. It was natural that a spirit of hostility to the crown should increase among them, although it was just at the time when such a feeling was more than ever perilous, since the monarchy was entering on the work of subjugating feudalism. This work was carried forward successfully by the famous minister of state, Cardinal Richelieu. By him the Huguenots, as a distinct political organization, were suppressed. In 1628, Rochelle, the last of their fortified towns, fell into his hands. The emigration of Protestants now set in—the process by which France forced beyond its borders the most valuable portion of its population. Under Louis XIV., Mazarin took up the policy of Richelieu. After Mazarin's death, the king, who had not been insensible to what he owed to the support of the Huguenots in the War of the Fronde, turned against them. This was owing to a torment of conscience, which his ignoble and superstitious mind sought to allay by the persecution of heretics. Madame de Maintenon, whom he had secretly married, urged him to this course, although she had once been a Huguenot herself. The king, moreover, in his arrogance, was irritated that insidious efforts to entice his Protestant subjects into a voluntary surrender of their chartered privileges had proved abortive. His father-confessor, La Chaise, and his war-minister, Louvois, spurred him on to the adoption of cruel measures of repression. In 1679, an extensive system of proselytizing was organized. All professed converts to the Roman faith who fell back were visited with severe penalties. Harsh punishment was threatened to every Roman Catholic who should go over to the Protestant Church. Marriages between the adherents of the two confessions were forbidden. The Huguenots were by degrees excluded from all offices and dignities. All these were among the many afflictions which they had to endure. At length the atrocious scheme of the *dragonnade*, or the billeting of soldiers in Huguenot families, was resorted to. It is impossible to enumerate here the various forms of unbearable brutality which were inflicted on an innocent and religious people by the fanaticism of the rulers of France, who were

instigated and applauded by the Church to which they belonged. In the course of three years, fifty thousand families had fled from the country. Those who yielded to terror were chiefly from the lower class or from the nobles. The middle class, including a great number of skilled artisans, generally remained steadfast. In 1685, the Edict of Nantes, the great charter of Huguenot rights, was revoked. Emigration went on in spite of hindrances placed in its way. Not far from a quarter of a million of refugees escaped from France to enrich England, Holland, and other countries with the fruits of their industries. Among them was Schomberg, one of the best generals of the time. "The French," said Voltaire, "were as widely dispersed as the Jews." France was impoverished, not only by this direct loss, but by the discouragement and the prostration of energy of their harassed brethren who remained behind.

Revocation
of the Edict
of Nantes.

Louis XIV. had been determined to extend his absolute authority over the Church as well as over the State. This purpose brought on a controversy between him and the papacy. His real aim was to exercise such power in ecclesiastical matters in France as Henry VIII. had taken to himself in England, but not to effect a complete rupture with Rome. The occasion of the dispute was the attempt of Louis to exact the vassal's oath from ecclesiastics in parts of France where it had not before been rendered, and to manage vacant sees in those districts, as well as to appropriate their revenues. This claim of the king was resisted by Innocent X. Under the pontificate of Innocent XI., the Assembly of the French Clergy supported the king's pretensions, and enacted the four Articles of Gallican freedom in affairs ecclesiastical. These denied the pope's authority over kings, or in aught but spiritual matters, and asserted that the pope is bound by canon law, and by the laws and usages of the French Church, and that the pope's decisions in doctrine are not irreformable, unless they have the concurrence of the whole Church. Under Innocent XII. there was an accommodation. Louis retained the prerogative which had given rise to the quarrel, but yielded up the four obnoxious propositions. In the memorable contest with the papacy and in behalf of Gallican liberty, the champion of Louis

Contest of
Louis XIV.
with the
papacy.

1682.

Bossuet.

was Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux, one of the ablest and most eloquent theologians and most powerful prelates of the time. He was born at Dijon in 1627. In his boyhood he was a brilliant scholar, and versed in the classical authors. The prophecies of Isaiah kindled in his mind an ardent interest in the study of the

Scriptures. As a student at Paris, and as a priest, he extended the range of his studies. He made himself familiar with the Fathers, especially with Augustine. While tutor of the Dauphin, he wrote his "Discourse on Universal History." In the pulpit his oratorical powers elicited universal applause. Bossuet was a most accomplished polemic. His knowledge was completely at his command, so that he did not shrink from oral disputation with the most learned adversaries. His "Exposition of the Catholic Faith" presents the doctrines of Rome in a liberal and plausible form. His book on the "Variations of Protestantism" is an ingenious attempt to show that Protestantism is nothing but an open door to a chaos of clashing opinions, and that there is no escape from a hopeless jangle of conflicting views, except in submission to the authority of the Church. His quotations from the reformers are not infrequently garbled. Reference has been made to the countenance which Bossuet gave to the unrighteous and savage measures of Louis for the conversion and extermination of the Huguenots. Another stain was left on the reputation of Bossuet by the part which he took against Fénelon and the Mystics.

This development of mysticism in France has some connection with an earlier movement in the Roman Catholic Church, with Mysticism : which the name of Molinos is identified. Molinos. Molinos was born in 1640, of a noble family, in Aragon. In Rome he became highly esteemed as a spiritual director whose counsels were very much in request. In 1675 he published "The Spiritual Guide," in which are unfolded his ideas relative to a devout life and the true source of inward peace. This haven is to be sought in the retirement of the soul and in contemplation, in the renunciation of all desires for self, and in a complete self-surrender into the hands of God. Abstinence, maceration of the body, penances, could only be of use at the beginning of the course of self-discipline that leads up to the state of inward repose. The influence of the book of Molinos was immense. "Quietism," as the type of devotion was called which it recommended, won a great number of votaries in Spain and Italy. But the suspicions of the Jesuits were aroused. The inquisitors examined the book, arrested the author, and condemned his doctrines. In 1687 he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment, and remained in prison until his death. It was asserted that he abjured his doctrines, or the doctrines imputed to him; but this remains to be proved. Among the accusations were charges affecting the purity of his conduct. These are not credible. They may have grown out of a perverse construction of

expressions relative to the indifference of exterior acts when the soul is wedded to God—a notion not uncommon among mystics. But that he taught even this, there is no good evidence. The real ground of hostility to Quietism was its tendency to lead to the dispensing with auricular confession, penances, and outward rites altogether.

Ideas not unlike those of Molinos were cherished by Madame Guyon, a French lady of noble descent. She was born in 1648 and died in 1717. A decided religious and ascetic turn inclined her in childhood to take the veil. But she was married against her will, and thus prevented from carrying out her cherished desire. On the death of her husband, however, she devoted herself to Christian activities, mingled with devout contemplation, first at Gex, near Geneva, then at Thonon, and afterwards at Paris. Like Molinos, she taught that our aim should be perfection. This is to be attained by the absolute absorption of the human will in the divine, a rest of the soul in God. Bossuet and other prelates examined her writings, and pronounced them heretical. On the contrary, Fénelon, who had become her friend, refused to join in this judgment against the mystical teaching. He was in sympathy with it, and in his “Maxims of the Saints” inculcated its characteristic ideas. Fénelon was born in 1651 and died in 1715. When this controversy arose he deservedly enjoyed a high reputation. He had done a great work in Poitou in reclaiming Protestants by the use of persuasion and by kindly ways. He was an eloquent, spiritual preacher. He had been the tutor of the king’s grandsons, in which capacity he wrote his “Telemachus.” In 1695 he was made Archbishop of Cambray. He and Bossuet had been friends. The difference respecting the teachings of Madame Guyon and the value of the mystical system set them at variance. Fénelon appealed to Rome. Bossuet sent there an answer to his plea. The Sorbonne condemned the propositions of Fénelon. Then the pope, in 1699, declared that the doctrines of his book were erroneous. He at once publicly retracted them. In refinement, gentleness, and in all the graces of Christian character, he excels his great antagonist, whose robust intelligence and polemical skill equipped him for victory in a doctrinal encounter.

Another important transaction in the reign of Louis XIV. was the conflict with the Jansenists, the school of Augustinian theologians, of whom Pascal was the most renowned. The victory which the Jesuits gained in this contest was achieved through the aid

rendered by the king. The circumstances of this conflict with the Port Royalists will be related hereafter.

Efforts and projects looking towards union between Protestants and Catholics deserve notice. Earnest but abortive endeavors of

Schemes of
Church union.

Calixtus,
(1586-
1656.)

this nature are associated, in the sixteenth century, with the name of George Cassander (1515-1566), a moderate Roman Catholic, who was encouraged by the Emperor Ferdinand I., and, in the seventeenth, with the name of George Calixtus, a Lutheran of the school of Melancthon. Grotius became a warm advocate of ecclesiastical reunion, and published several writings in which he tried to soften the antipathy of Protestants to the Church of Rome and to prepare the way for a universal council at which all parties might be represented. In the latter part of the seventeenth century, Spinola, a Spanish ecclesiastic, resident at Vienna, labored, in connection with a Lutheran theologian, Molanus, to devise a plan of union between Catholics and Protestants. Out of this effort there grew an interesting correspondence between Leibnitz and Bossuet on the same theme. Leibnitz was in favor of a general council, according to the idea of Grotius. He insisted on the need of reducing the essentials of the faith to such a degree as to leave room under the same roof for the divergences of the antagonistic parties. The point on which these two representatives of the opposing parties could not come together was the doctrine of transubstantiation.

CHAPTER II.

ECCLESIASTICAL EVENTS ON THE CONTINENT OF EUROPE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY PRIOR TO THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

THE eighteenth century was signalized by a breaking away from the traditions of the past in every department of thought and inquiry. It is commonly designated by the Germans as

Character of
the eighteenth
century.

the period of "illuminism"—*Aufklärung*. Men were elated by the persuasion that the clouds of ignorance and prejudice which had before darkened the human mind were now dispersed. They could gaze up to a cloudless sky. Common-sense, it was claimed, was at last to have a chance to exercise its prerogative. The prevalent rationalizing spirit brought on everywhere a conflict with established opinions and with traditional

usages and institutions. The tone of literature changed. Clerical control in matters of culture was abjured. The freedom of the days of the Renaissance was restored, yet with a lack of depth and imaginative power. Culture took on a brilliant but superficial character. Superstitions which were responsible for much tyranny and distress were exploded. But in connection with this measure of wholesome progress, the spirit of free inquiry, instead of being tempered by religious aspirations, was infected with a bias towards scepticism and unbelief. There ensued a literary crusade of deistic infidelity, springing up first in England, transplanted and taking root in France, and from there spreading over the Continent. In France the outcome was a materialistic atheism. In the higher circles of society, indifferentism and a mocking disbelief were coupled with profligacy. Among the clergy a frigid or lukewarm temper prevailed. The writers who figured as the heralds of new ideas in letters and philosophy were personally intimate with sovereigns, such as Frederic II. of Prussia, Charles III. of Spain, and Catharine II. of Russia. They had the ear of statesmen who stood at the helm in public affairs, like Pombal in Portugal, Choiseul in France, and Aranda in Spain. Paris was the centre whence fashions in opinion as well as in social customs were diffused through Europe. The spread of the French language, which was everywhere the speech of courts and of polite society, and took the place of Latin as a vehicle of literary and diplomatic intercourse, is a symbol of the extension of French influence, not only in reference to matters of etiquette, furniture, gardening, and building, but also in the field of practical morals and religious speculation. The causes of the state of things thus indicated are not far to seek. The prolonged theological conflicts of the preceding period had been succeeded by a lassitude of spirit as regards religion, and a reaction against whatever savored of dogmatism in belief. Men were tired of the warfare of creeds. The civil wars of the seventeenth century had chilled the spirit of piety. The conflicts of the eighteenth century were dynastic struggles, caused mainly by the ambition of Louis XIV., and by the efforts of Frederick the Great to build up the power of Prussia. Generally speaking, they called into exercise no exalted patriotic passion, no deep-rooted moral sentiment. The grand discoveries of Newton, following upon the philosophical teaching of Lord Bacon a century earlier, had ushered in a new era of investigation in physical science. Many inquisitive minds were turning from the reasonings of the schools to the fresh and alluring domain of experi-

Causes of the
decline of
religion.

mental study. Notwithstanding the obvious defects and faults of the eighteenth century, there is much to be set down to its credit. If it was the age of Bolingbroke and Voltaire, it was also the age of Addison and Johnson. The delusions and persecutions connected with the belief in witchcraft came to an end. A beneficent work of reform in criminal jurisprudence began. Above all, there were great religious movements, especially Moravianism in Germany and Methodism in England, the influence of which was profound and durable.

An event highly important in itself, and at the same time well adapted to illustrate the altered character of the age, was the Downfall of the Jesuits. downfall, and the temporary extinction in all Catholic countries, of the Society of Jesus. In the middle of the eighteenth century this famous body comprised not far from twenty thousand members. They were busily at work in all parts of the world. They had possessed themselves of a great amount of property. The education of youth in many lands was to a large extent in their hands. Several universities—for example, Vienna and Prague—were completely subject to their control. The father-confessors of kings and princes, they exerted a powerful influence in the civil administration of European states. In the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV., they had been dominant in France. But, owing to various causes, the spirit of opposition to them at length rose to a great height. The teaching of the Spaniard, Mariana, one of their writers, that regicide is lawful, was believed to have led to the murder of Henry IV. of France. The assassination of his predecessor, Henry III., as well as of William of Orange, was traced by many to the poisonous doctrine of Jesuit teachers. The lax theology of Jesuit doctors, who were of the Semi-Pelagian school, stirred up an antagonism among the more orthodox Dominicans, who clung tenaciously to the system of Aquinas. Especially the loose moral maxims which became current among the Jesuits, brought upon them deserved odium. The doctrine of “moral probableism,” which made, in doubtful questions of duty, the opinion of a single doctor of authority a warrant for an action which he had pronounced innocent, was specially obnoxious. This theory had not been originated by the Jesuits: it was of earlier date. They made so great use of it, however, that it was considered a distinctive part of their system. Some of their leaders did not hesitate to avow that they had made the means of salvation easier, and had opened a more facile way to absolution for such as resorted to the confessional when they sat in judgment. The

Port Royalists had been overthrown by the force which the Jesuits were able to invoke in aid of their cause from a cruel and superstitious monarch; but the satire of Pascal, in the "Provincial Letters," continued to move the admiration and sympathy of a multitude of cultivated persons by whom Escobar, Sanchez, and other Jesuit authorities, who stood in the pillory on his pages, were regarded with mingled hatred and contempt. More than one pontiff, in the latter part of the seventeenth century, had interposed to condemn the ethical precepts which had been promulgated by members of the order. More than one had directly or indirectly sought to curb their ambition and keep within bounds their greed for gain. Considered as the champions of "obscurantism," they were exposed to the determined hostility of all the advocates of free-thinking.

The Jesuits at the outset, and for a long period, had been obedient to the pontiffs and devoted to building up their authority. But it became manifest, as time went on, that the interests of their order and the mandates of its general had the highest place in their esteem. In the early part of the reign of Louis XIV., while he was in a contest with Rome, they lent their aid to the king. The first very serious collision between the Jesuit order and the authorities of the Church related to the conduct of their missions. In what were called the "Malabar customs," or rites, the Jesuits went so far in the way of indulging their converts in the retention of heathen practices and beliefs as to provoke the hostility of missionaries of the other orders, and finally of the popes themselves. Even Bellarmine, the celebrated Jesuit theologian, disapproved of their accommodating policy in dealing with the heathen. But the Franciscans became loud in their complaints, which were reechoed in 1631 by the Dominicans in China. The Chinese observances were prohibited by Innocent X., in 1645, but were sanctioned by Alexander VII., about ten years later. At the beginning of the new century the long conflict broke out afresh. The Jesuits persevered in disregarding the injunctions of the popes to abandon the obnoxious usages. De Tournon, the Patriarch of Antioch, whom the pontiff sent to the missions on a tour of inspection, was maltreated by them in China, and was cast into prison, where he died. When Clement XII. issued a decree forbidding the Malabar customs, the Jesuits in India promulgated it in Latin, a language which their converts of course could not understand. Father Norbert, the delegate of the Capuchins, carried their complaints to Rome, which caused Benedict XIV. to prohibit, in the

Conduct of
Jesuit Mis-
sionaries.

1710.

1734.

strictest manner, the objectionable rites. Norbert published an historical account of these controversies in the East. After this, his life was not considered safe by the pope himself, so that he took up his abode in Protestant lands until the Jesuits were driven from Portugal. Repeated edicts of the Roman See were stubbornly disregarded and resisted by the Jesuits in the East, until, finally, in 1741, they gave way, and the bull of Benedict XIV. produced its effect. The missionaries were forced to yield a reluctant obedience to the reiterated decrees of the pontiffs.

What brought to pass the downfall of the Jesuits was their active interference in political affairs, and the way in which they engaged in trade and commercial speculations. Their missionary stations were in reality factories, and the centres of a lucrative commerce. Nowhere was the order more powerful in Church and State than in the Spanish peninsula. It was in Portugal that they first received the heaviest blow. Cavalho, the Marquis of Pombal, a man of winning and imposing presence, and of great ability, acquired the unbounded confidence of King Joseph Emanuel I. The indolent character of this monarch, and the morbid melancholy which he shared with other sovereigns of his family, disposed him to rely upon the guidance of so competent a minister. The king's esteem for him was confirmed, in 1755, by the presence of mind, and by the wise and efficient measures, of Pombal, on the occasion of the earthquake, with the attendant disasters from fire and flood, by which thirty thousand inhabitants of Lisbon perished. The sympathies of the minister were with the progressive ideas of the age. He was bent on delivering the king from the thralldom involved in the overgrown influence of the Jesuits, and of the higher nobility in alliance with them. In 1753, by a treaty between Spain and Portugal, certain provinces in South America were exchanged. A portion of Paraguay fell to Brazil. The attempt to take possession of it was met by the resistance of the natives, who were instigated by their Jesuit guides. It was found that a community had been constituted in which the Jesuits exercised absolute rule in all civil and religious affairs, and that they had trained their converts in the use of arms. By way of defence, it was pretended that the fault was with the natives, whose fury could not be curbed. These circumstances excited the sternest resentment. Pombal determined to put down the Jesuit influence in Portugal. He began, in 1757, by dismissing the Jesuit chaplains of the royal family, and by replacing them with ordinary priests. Other measures conceived in the same spirit followed.

Expulsion of
the Jesuits
from Portu-
gal.

An attempt was made to assassinate the king. He was wounded, but not mortally. Some of the highest nobles, women as well as men, were arrested and brought to the scaffold. Jesuits with whom they were intimate were accused, without sufficient proof, of complicity in the plot. The whole society was charged with treason-
September 1, 1759. able intentions. A decree was issued by which they were deposed from their places in all schools and universities, and banished in a body from Portugal and from its dependencies. They were conveyed to Italy in crowded ships, in which they endured much hardship.

In France, Madame de Pompadour, the mistress of Louis XV., was hostile to the order, and this, perhaps, for reasons not dis-
Expulsion of the Jesuits from France and Spain. creditable to it. The immediate cause of their expulsion from the kingdom was the bankruptcy of Father Lavalette, the Jesuit administrator in Martinique, who was unable to meet the heavy liabilities which he incurred in consequence of the wreck of certain vessels loaded with goods for which French merchants had paid. The society refused to be answerable for this loss of the bold speculator. The result of the litigation was the requirement, by the civil and ecclesiastical authorities of France, that the constitutions of the order should be modified and the power of the general abridged. To this demand, Ricci, who held this office, replied: "Sint ut sunt, aut non sint;" "Let them be as they are, or let them not be at all." A succession of edicts against the society followed until 1767, when its members were all expelled from France. The same year Spain adopted a like measure, both for herself and her colonies. From Spain alone nearly six thousand priests were deported at once, under circumstances that necessarily involved great suffering. The same measure was adopted by Naples and Parma. The Bourbon courts were united in the proscription of the order, and joined together in demanding at Rome its abolition. In 1769, by means of their influence, Cardinal Ganganelli, a Franciscan, a man of upright principles and spotless character, was chosen pope, under the name of Clement XIV. He took time to deliberate on the proposal which
The Jesuit Society abolished by the pope, July 21, 1773. was urged upon his acceptance. He finally resolved to comply with it, although he was reported to have said that in issuing the decree for the annihilation of this society he was signing his own death-warrant. In fact, within about a year after its promulgation, on September 22, 1774, he died under such circumstances as to lead to the belief, which, however, there is not sufficient proof to establish, that he was poi-

soned. The bull of Clement—*Dominus ac redemptor noster*—for the abolition of the order is most carefully and elaborately composed. Not a loop-hole is left for evasion, or for the avoidance, in any way, of its stringent and sweeping provisions. The ground on which the act is founded is the manifold strife and disturbances of which the Jesuits had become the occasion. If there is no explicit sanction given to the specific charges against them, there is a pretty clear intimation of the pontiff's sympathy with the accusers. Only in lands not acknowledging the pope—in Russia, and in Prussia, which was ruled by Frederic II., could the order continue to subsist. Later, in Prussia it was abolished by Frederic William II. By subsequent bulls of popes, the Jesuits were authorized to reconstitute themselves in North Russia, and in Naples and Sicily. The formal restoration of the order and revocation of the decrees against it, took place at the fall of Napoleon, as one fruit of the reaction in behalf of "the throne and the altar."

The Jesuits owed their downfall to grievous faults of their own, and to the practical renunciation of the ideals which had been cherished by the founders of the society. They had become deeply infected with worldliness and thirst for gain, and aspired to be masters rather than servants of the papacy. But other causes were potent in bringing to pass their suppression—the spirit of free-thinking that was abroad, impatience of ecclesiastical control and influence, and the disposition of statesmen and princes to rule, instead of being ruled by, the Church. For ten years after the deportation of the Jesuits, the Portuguese Government had been in a conflict with the papacy. Pombal's reforms included such measures as the prohibiting of the publication of bulls against any of the officers of State without the king's authorization, and the abolition of numerous monasteries and nunneries. Schools of all kinds were established for the instruction of the people. The kingdom was advancing to a high degree of prosperity in trade and industry. But the death of the monarch, who confided in Pombal to the last, was followed by the fall of that minister, and the undoing of many of his most beneficent works.

Elsewhere, like reforms, looking to the independence of States and the reduction of foreign ecclesiastical influence, were vigorously undertaken. Maximilian Joseph III., Elector of Bavaria, a devout and loyal Catholic in his creed, instituted very important changes of this character ; but his reign was too short to secure for them permanence. The most notable

Ecclesiastical
reforms in
Portugal.

Reforms of
Joseph II.
1745-1747.

movement in this direction took place under the auspices of the Emperor Joseph II., in Austria. The preparation for such a movement was made by the publication of a remarkable work on the "State of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Roman Pontiff," which appeared under the name of Febronius, but of which the real author proved to be Nicholas von Hontheim, suffragan bishop of the Elector of Treves. This work asserted the Gallican doctrine of the supremacy of general councils over popes, and the equality of bishops, among whom the pope has a simple primacy, of which, moreover, he may be deprived. It denied the pope's authority in other dioceses than his own, and restricted his function, as regards other bishops, to the giving of counsels and admonitions. The decrees of a council require no ratification from a pontiff, nor is it requisite that he should be the person to convoke it. The book of Febronius was widely circulated, and produced a strong impression. It was condemned at once at Rome. After great efforts, the author, who was an old man, was induced, in 1778, to make a retraction, which he followed with a commentary upon it, in which he made it plain that he had not altered his opinions.

Joseph II. succeeded his mother, Maria Theresa, in 1780. The next year he issued an Edict of Toleration. Under the shield of it, many Protestant congregations were formed in the Austrian states. This measure was succeeded by legislative acts of a radical nature which were in accord with the ideas of Febronius. In all matters of external government and worship, the Church was to be governed by the sovereign. The jurisdiction of the pope was reduced to the narrowest limits. He was not to confer any titles on the emperor's subjects without his consent, nor could any papal document be published within his realm without his express permission. Monks were to be subject to no foreign superiors. There was to be no appeal to Rome in matrimonial causes. Joseph even ordered the bull *In cœna domini*, in which, in its final form, Urban VIII. (in 1627) had asserted the prerogatives of the see of St. Peter

1713. against lay rulers and councils, and the bull *Unigenitus*, which Clement XI. had promulgated against the Jansenists, to be torn out of the ritual books. Soon after, the king abolished all orders not actively engaged in works of education or charity, and converted their property into an educational fund.

Pius VI.
(1774-1799)
and Joseph II.

The services of the Church he required to be conducted in the vernacular. The controversy with the pope (Pius VI.), consequent on these innovations, was of such a character that at one time Joseph thought of imitating the ex-

ample of Henry VIII. by taking the extreme step of breaking off Austria from its connection with Rome. But in consequence of the counsels of sagacious statesmen, who convinced him that he was moving too fast for his people, he took pains, without revoking his laws, to avoid a rupture with the pope. His attempt to introduce and to enforce like regulations in the Netherlands was met by a resistance that led, in 1789, to an insurrection, which ended in failure. Leopold II., Joseph's brother, repealed a number of his ordinances; and under his successor, Francis II., the former religious status in the Austrian dominions was gradually restored.

The example of Joseph II. was contagious. A congress or conference of Catholic archbishops was held at Ems, in 1786, which adopted a "punctuation," or programme, defining the rights of bishops and archbishops, in opposition to all the pseudo-Isidorian prerogatives exercised by Rome. If appeals were taken from verdicts of German prelates, they must be reviewed by judges appointed, to be sure, by the pope, but of German birth and holding their courts in Germany. A limit was to be set to the sending of money to Rome. The reform, thus undertaken, was baffled, in part by the shrewd management of the pontiffs, in part by the selfish policy of the Elector of Mayence, and especially by the outbreak of the French Revolution, which turned thought into other channels. An important effort, made in 1780 by P  ter Leopold, Grand Duke of Tuscany, to emulate the example of his brother, Joseph II., by sweeping away the usurpations of Rome, by the improvement of education, etc., proved abortive, on account of the refusal of the Tuscan bishops to co-operate with him. The various plans of reform in different countries to which reference has been made, were too much the offspring of the spirit of free-thinking as distinguished from profound religious conviction, and were too exclusively the work of princes and cabinets, to strike deep root in the soil. They showed that the papacy had but a slender hold on the reverence of the ruling class in the different states of Europe.

In the record of ecclesiastical affairs in Germany, in the eighteenth century, a conspicuous place belongs to the rise, or, rather, the reorganization of the Moravians. The Moravians, or the "United Brethren," as they styled themselves, sprang from the "Bohemian Brethren," a branch of Hussite Christians. These had belonged neither to the Calixtines nor to the Taborites, the two principal parties into which the Hussites were divided after the death of their leader. The "Breth-

Ecclesiastical
reform in Ger-
many and
Tuscany.

The Moravi-
ans at Herrn-
hut: Zinzen-
dorf.

ren" cherished the spirit of Christianity, according to their degree of knowledge, with simple fidelity. When Protestantism arose, they came into intercourse both with Lutherans and Calvinists, but had more sympathy with the latter. In 1722, and in the seven following years, a considerable number of these "Brethren," led by Christian David, who were persecuted in their homes, were received by Count Zinzendorf on his estate at Berthelsdorf in Saxony. They founded a village called Herrnhut, or, "the Watch of the Lord." There they were joined by Christians from other places in Germany, and, after some time, Zinzendorf took up his abode among them, and became their principal guide and pastor. His ancestors had been possessed of wealth and distinction in Austria. He was born in Dresden in 1700. His father having died, he was brought up by his grandmother, who was full of sympathy with the religious movement called "Pietism," of which Spener was the leading representative. Young Zinzendorf studied in the grammar-school at Halle under Francke, one of the most devout leaders of the same school. At Wittenberg he pursued the study of law, as his relatives were opposed to his entering the ministry, to which he was strongly inclined. He lost no opportunity of doing good by stimulating others to renewed earnestness in the Christian life. At Dresden, where he held an office under the Saxon Government, he conducted religious meetings of the kind which Spener had instituted. At length, in 1737, he consecrated himself wholly to the service of God in connection with the Moravian settlement, and was ordained a bishop—one of their number, Nitschmann, having been previously, through his influence, ordained (in 1735) to the same office by Jablonski, the oldest of the Moravian bishops, who resided in Berlin. Zinzendorf had before been received into the Lutheran ministry. The peculiar fervor which characterized his religious work, and certain particulars in his teaching, caused the Saxon Government, which was wedded to the traditional ways of Lutheranism, to exclude him from Saxony for about ten years (1736-1747). He prosecuted his religious labors in Frankfort, journeyed through Holland and England, made a voyage to the West Indies, and, in 1741, another voyage to America. New branches of the Moravian body he planted in the countries which he visited. Not only by word of mouth, but also by numerous writings, he instructed and inspired those who were willing to attend to his teaching. His chief talent, however, was that of an administrator. The Moravians were generally gathered in towns, and owned the land within their limits. In

The Moravian
organization.

the local church, or town, they were divided into classes or "choirs," with an elder or deaconess at the head of each. Their ecclesiastical affairs were regulated by a carefully devised system of boards and synods. The bishops had no diocese committed to them severally, but collectively watched over the spiritual welfare of the entire body. It was a church within a church that Zinzendorf aimed to establish. It was far from his purpose to found a sect antagonistic to the national churches in the midst of which the Moravian societies arose. His theology, in its main features, was evangelical Lutheranism. But the larger infusion of warmth and religious sentiment was offensive to the more stiff and lukewarm exponents of the current orthodoxy. Such practices as the use of the lot to decide doubtful questions of importance, which he adopted, were looked upon as superstitious. Extravagances of expression, especially in Zinzendorf's hymns, on the believer's communion with Jesus, and an occasional tendency to push the Divine Father into the background in the contemplations and prayers of the worshipper, naturally gave offence to some, like the eminent theologian, Bengel, who were not chargeable with a want of the true spirit of devotion. With a religious life remarkable as combining warm emotion with a quiet and serene type of feeling, the community of Zinzendorf connected a missionary zeal not equalled at that time in any other Protestant communion. Although few in number, they sent their gospel messengers to all quarters of the globe. At the same time, they were exceedingly useful in awakening the Lutheran Church from the lethargy which prevailed in it, and did much to diffuse a more living piety. Their schools drew into them large numbers who were not connected with the Moravian Church; "and, during the long and dreary period of rationalism, they afforded a sanctuary for the old gospel, with its blessed promises and glorious hopes."

A religious phenomenon of the eighteenth century, of a quite anomalous character, was the appearance of Swedenborgianism.

Emanuel Swedenborg was the son of a Lutheran bishop, Jesper Swedenborg, a highly cultivated, upright, and religious man. The son in early childhood was deeply interested in religious contemplation. He became a student at the University of Upsal, studied Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and was a great proficient in mathematical and physical science. He travelled extensively. For thirty years he held important offices in the College of Mines, and was brought into intimate relations with the king, Charles XII. He wrote not less than seventy-seven treatises on

Influence of
the Moravi-
ans.

Swedenborg,
1688-1772.

scientific subjects, which evinced an untiring industry coupled with an extraordinary capacity for these investigations. It was in 1743 that he first believed himself to have a vision of Christ, and to be brought into a direct communication with angels, and an immediate spiritual intuition of the supernatural states of existence. Heaven and hell were unveiled to him. He held actual converse with the departed. This sort of intercourse and perception went on, as a very frequent experience, until the close of his life. The followers of Swedenborg regard it as real; disbelievers in the claims which he put forth think that he was subject to hallucination. That he was a man of integrity as well as of genius it would be wrong to doubt. On his death-bed he averred the reality of the supernatural disclosures made to him. Swedenborg's system is expounded in numerous publications, of which the "*Arcana*

Coelestia" is one of the most important, as well as in His tenets. a mass of manuscripts still unprinted. The first striking peculiarity of the system is the connection of nature and religion, of natural science and religious doctrine or speculation. He considers the universe as one whole, in which the outward and visible is the counterpart of the inward and spiritual. In this he reminds us of the Gnostics and other schools of theosophy. He dissents in many points from the ordinary church theology. The main features of his system are these: God is infinite, and is in his essence wisdom and love, but he exists in a human, although, of course, immaterial form; so that man is literally in God's image. There is a law of correspondence, with wide and varied applications. The external world corresponds to man's nature. Man is a microcosm; he is imaged and prefigured in external nature. There is a correspondence between the visible world and the world invisible. As to the Bible, most, but not all, of the books of the Old Testament, the Gospels, and the Apocalypse contain, beneath the literal sense, the word of God, or an occult sense open only to spiritual discernment. There is, in truth, in the New Testament a threefold sense—the literal; the spiritual, which refers to the kingdom of the Lord; and the heavenly, which pertains to the Lord himself. The creation is not from nothing, but is from God's love through the agency of his wisdom. There is an approach to an ideal theory of matter; yet Swedenborg keeps clear of pantheism. The fall of man brought a loss of spiritual perception, and hereditary evil, which, however, is not all derived from our first progenitors. "It consists in willing, and thence thinking, evil." The Trinity is conceived of in a Sabellian way: there was no Trinity

before the creation. Jehovah is one person. Jesus derived his body from Mary. That which is Divine in Christ is the Father, the name of God after he has "assumed the Human;" the Divine in this connection with the Human is the Son; the Divine which proceeds from him is the Holy Spirit. Christ gained a victory over the powers of hell. The ordinary idea of an atonement by penal substitution Swedenborg rejects. Christ is glorified, and through him, the Divine man, we have the true idea of God and are conjoined by love to him. Justification by faith alone is a doctrine which Swedenborg denounces. The idea of a physical resurrection is discarded. At death the eyes of men are opened to the spiritual world in which they really exist now. After death they live at first essentially as they have lived here, and in a similar environment. At length they are drawn by their own affinities either to hell or to heaven. Angels are the spirits of departed human beings.

Swedenborg sojourned for a considerable time, in the course of his life, in England. There and in Germany, as well as in Sweden, Swedenborgian societies. he had followers, who united themselves in societies. In 1788 a company of them began public worship in London. Swedenborg held that the Second Advent of the Lord took place in 1757, when the spiritual world was unveiled to him. The judgment took place then; for all the New Testament predictions relative to these events are treated by him as symbolical. A new heaven and a new earth, and the New Jerusalem foretold in the Apocalypse, appeared in 1771, when the Swedenborgian Church emerged into being. The adherents of Swedenborg, in accordance with this idea, named their organizations the "New Jerusalem Church."

CHAPTER III.

RELIGION IN ENGLAND AND REVIVALS IN AMERICA IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.

In the eighteenth century, down to the rise of Methodism, the religious condition of England was such as to call imperatively for a great reformation. The decline of a living faith in the verities of the gospel had not lessened the bitterness of ecclesiastical warfare. As long as William III. lived, the Low Church party, which was firm in its adherence to Episcopacy

Religious
parties under
William III.
and Anne.

and the establishment, but decided in its sympathy with the definite Protestantism of the nonconformists, was in the ascendant. The Whigs, the authors and supporters of the Revolution which had placed William and Mary on the throne, were disposed to sustain the principles of the Toleration Act. But the moderate or latitudinarian Churchmen, with the government of William to support them, had not been able to legalize the policy of comprehension. Against it, in favor of the establishment, but hostile to the control of the Church by the State, or to the Erastian theory, were both branches of the High Church party. The first consisted of the nonjurors and their followers, who had been deprived of their benefices for their refusal to take the oaths of allegiance to the successors of James II. The second comprised those who, in general, sympathized with them, but who had, with reluctance, taken the oaths. Both sections prized the "Anglo-Catholic" theology, disliked the nonconformists personally, and looked down on them as schismatics. Queen Anne succeeded to the throne as the successor of her brother-in-law in 1702. Her preferences were on the side of the High Churchmen and of the Tories. While the bishops were of the opposite party, a majority of the clergy, and the universities, were passionately averse to it. Attachment to the dethroned house of Stuart was wide-spread, and was a latent but dangerous force which Whig statesmen had constantly to take into account. The strength of the High Church and Tory sentiment was made manifest in 1709, in the case of Dr. Sacheverell, a man of weak character and inferior talents, but who was raised for a time to the rank of a hero, on account of the condemnation by the House of Lords of two sermons in which he had denounced the Toleration Act and advocated the doctrine of passive obedience. On the expiration of his sentence of suspension from preaching, he received tokens of honor from the House of Commons and from the Queen. The reaction against dissent showed itself in more offensive and mischievous ways. By the Test Act, passed in 1673, all persons who were admitted to civil or military office had been required to receive the Sacrament according to the forms of the Church of England. It was not uncommon for Nonconformists to partake of the communion occasionally with Episcopalians; and, although they considered the law requiring it unjust, they were willing to do so when elected to office. To cut off this class from public employments, in 1711 the Occasional Conformity Bill was passed, by which severe penalties were inflicted on those who should thus

Oppressive
laws against
dissenters.

receive the Sacrament, but afterwards, during their term of office, attend a "conventicle." Two years later, the Schism Bill was passed, forbidding the exercise of the function of schoolmaster or private teacher, without a declaration of conformity and a license from a bishop. The cry that the "Church is in danger" prevented the repeal of these oppressive enactments until the following reign. Even then the Test and Corporation Acts, which were of like tenor, had to be left on the statute book, so violent was the opposition to their repeal, and so fearful were many who were favorable to it of a schism among the Episcopalians, or an outbreak of Jacobite hostility to the Hanoverian line. With the reign of George II. there was an increase of tolerance. Relief was given to dissenters by annual indemnity acts. Not until 1828 were these laws erased from the statute book. Under George III. the Church was fully allied to the king. A gradual relaxation of the penal code, as it affected Roman Catholics as well as the non-conforming bodies, commenced. It was, however, a "halting and unsteady" progress, which is thus sketched by Mr. May, in his "Constitutional History:" "Sometimes Catholics received indulgence; and sometimes a particular sect of nonconformists. First one grievance was redressed, and then another; but Parliament continued to shrink from the broad assertion of religious liberty as the right of British subjects and the policy of the State. Toleration and connivance at dissent had already succeeded to active persecution; society had outgrown the law; but a century of strife and agitation had yet to pass before the penal code was blotted out and religious liberty established."

Meantime, while the contests to which we have adverted were going forward, the cause of practical religion was at a low ebb.

Low condition of religion and morals.

Among the higher classes, infidelity was the fashion. Bishop Butler, in the preface to the "Analogy," remarks that it had "come to be taken for granted that Christianity is not so much as a subject of inquiry; but that it is now at length discovered to be fictitious." Elsewhere, in a charge written in 1751, he affirms "the deplorable distinction" of that age to be "an avowed scorn of religion in some and a growing disregard of it in the generality." Dean Swift, who is an example of a class of men who could climb by political influence to very high, if not the highest, stations in the Church, published in 1709 an essay entitled, "Project for the Advancement of Religion." He says that "hardly one in a hundred among our people of quality or gentry appears to act by any principle of religion; nor," he adds, "is the

case much better with the vulgar." His remedy for irreligion is for persons in power to make "religion the necessary step to favor and preferment"—meaning by religion decorous conduct and attendance at church! Religion, he urges, must be made "to be the turn and fashion of the age." Walpole and many other prominent leaders in political affairs were guilty of an unblushing immorality in private life. Among the lower classes, lawlessness and vice prevailed to an alarming extent and with little restraint. A fair picture of the morals and manners of the times may be seen in the works of Hogarth, who was a close observer of the different phases of social life. The growth of the large towns by the progress of commerce had been accompanied with no corresponding provisions for the religious teaching of the people. There were no new churches, and no schools except those founded by Edward VI. and Elizabeth. The criminal class were so bold that life and property were insecure, and the cruel severity of the laws, with the multitude of executions, had no effect in inspiring them with terror. The clergy, who for a long period were estranged from the bishops, were, with not a few noble exceptions, ignorant and inert. "Those who have read some few books," says Bishop Burnet, "yet never seem to have read the Scriptures." The system of pluralities left many of them with the most meagre support, and degraded them to a low point in social standing. The political influence of the Church, it may be remarked, was more and more reduced. The clergy were no longer permitted to debate in convocation. This was a consequence of the "Bangor controversy." After the lower house in this clerical assembly had denounced a sermon of Hoadley, Bishop of Bangor, which leaned decidedly towards principles of liberty that were regarded with favor by nonconformists, convocation was prorogued, in 1717, and from that time until 1854 transacted no business. The habit of preachers in this period was to dwell more on the particulars of morality than on the distinctive doctrines of the gospel. The tone of the pulpit was studiously calm and moderate. A conventional decorum presided over the style and delivery of sermons. Arianism and even Socinianism spread widely among the clergy within and without the Established Church. A loose theory of subscription was adopted which opened a way for those who held views of this character to accept the Thirty-nine Articles, which were imposed not only on the clergy, but on all members of the universities. The confutations of deism frequently dwelt on the essential unity of Christian doctrine with the fundamental principles of natural theology, and passed lightly over the characteristic features of revelation.

It must not be forgotten, to be sure, that works in defence of Christianity were written by Berkeley, Butler, Lardner, and other writers of extraordinary talents and exemplary piety. Yet of the English church of the last century, it has been said with truth that "its leading characteristic was eminent respectability; its preaching had the mild accent of that apologetic period when, as Johnson put it, "the apostles were tried regularly once a week on charge of committing forgery." At the universities, formalism and disbelief united in creating an atmosphere in which manifestations of devoutness were a theme of derision. Gibbon, who was enrolled as a student at Magdalen College in 1752, has presented in his autobiography a vivid picture of the indolence, the convivial habits, and the cold and unspiritual tone which prevailed at that seat of learning. "In heart, indeed, England remained religious." Religion was deeply intrenched in the middle class of society. The Puritan spirit had not died out. In many a parish church, and in many a dissenting congregation, the gospel was faithfully preached and practically accepted. Yet what was needed was a new breath of life, a more kindling proclamation of the old truth, which might convince the understanding and mould the conduct of many, but no longer deeply stirred the emotions or exerted a renovating power in the bosom of society.

If religion in England in the early part of the eighteenth century wore a prosaic aspect, there were not wanting symptoms of a spiritual reaction. There were divines who were disposed to give to sensibility and emotion an important part in practical religion. Such were Doddridge and Watts among dissenters, and, in the Established Church, the devout Bishop Thomas Wilson, the author of "Sacra Privata," and other devotional books. The writer who, above all others, led to a spiritual awakening of the character described was William Law. Dr. Johnson said that the first occasion of his "thinking in earnest on religion" was the reading at Oxford of Law's "Serious Call to a Holy and Devoted Life," and he calls it "the finest piece of hortatory theology in any language." Gibbon says of the author, who was a tutor in his father's house, that "if he finds a spark of piety in his reader's mind, he will soon kindle it to a flame," and that "he believed all he professed and practised all he enjoined." John Wesley allowed that the "Serious Call," and the "Christian Perfection," another work by Law, sowed the seed of Methodism. Law was a nonjuring divine, not consenting to take the required oaths at the accession of George I. In the early part of his career as an author, he wrote

LAW,
1686-1761.

on the High Church side against Hoadley. He was an acute antagonist of deism, and maintained the absolute necessity and the sufficiency of the evidence from miracles for the Christian faith. But his mystical tendencies, which were fostered by Jacob Böhme, of whom he was an admiring student, led to a change in his way of thinking. Insight, the illumination of the spirit, the new life itself, which divine grace plants in the soul, he now held to be the one adequate verification of the gospel. To justification he gave a subjective, personal character, in contrast with the forensic view. Christ, he taught, did not suffer "to quiet an angry Deity;" he took upon him the state of our fallen nature, to overcome all the evils which the fall had entailed; from him we receive "a birth, a nature, a power to become the sons of God." None will be finally lost unless infinite love shall find them incorrigible. The departure of Law from the ordinary formulas of doctrine on the topics just adverted to, and still more the adoption from Böhme, along with deep truth, of various fantastic speculations, raised up opponents. But the elevated character and substantial merit of his principal treatises have been discerned by the most competent judges of differing schools of thought.

Law carried to the farthest point the antipathy which was once more reviving among good men against the stage. The Puritans were inimical to the theatre, especially after the morality of the drama began to sink, in the closing days of Elizabeth. The prohibition of plays attended the forbidding of bear-baiting, cock-fights, and horse-races. In 1642 Parliament made stage-plays unlawful, as not compatible with the distracted and distressed state of England, and as "too commonly expressing lascivious mirth and levity." After the Restoration, partly in consequence of the vain attempt under the Commonwealth to legislate the people into sanctity, the drama came back, and in the hands of comic writers assumed a shameless indecency. The theatre, as it flourished under the auspices of such authors as Wycherley and Congreve, was assailed in a most vigorous and effective publication of Jeremy Collier. His "Short View of the Immorality and Profaneness of the English Stage" was printed in 1698. A divine of great learning, a Jacobite and nonjuror, he could not be charged with Puritan fanaticism. His book not only provoked a great commotion, but had a highly beneficial result. He easily demolished the answer of Congreve, and he touched the conscience of Dryden. Law's principles were more ascetic, and hence his invectives against the stage are more indiscriminate than the trenchant indictment

of Collier. On this whole subject, the vivacious essay of Charles Kingsley—"Plays *versus* Puritans"—exposes many current misconceptions.

Methodism arose within the borders of the Episcopal Church. By the force of circumstances, and contrary to the original intention and preference of its founders, it drifted into a separate organization. The principal originators of the great religious revival of which Methodism was the offspring, were John Wesley and George Whitefield; but to the indomitable will and organizing genius, joined with the religious fervor, of Wesley, its existence as a distinct and influential body is chiefly due. His life extended over nearly the whole of the eighteenth century, for he was born in 1703 and died in 1791. He was the second of three sons of the rector of Epworth. The energy of his mother and her systematic training of a numerous family had their effect in developing and shaping the capacities of the future apostle and ruling spirit of the Methodist reformation. The three brothers were students at Christ Church College at Oxford, John having been first sent to the Charter House School. After taking his degree he was ordained deacon, and elected a fellow of Lincoln College. For two years he assisted his father as curate. He was ordained priest in 1728, soon after returned to Oxford, and became tutor at Lincoln. There he organized a small society of young men for the cultivation of personal piety and for doing good. One of them was his younger brother, Charles Wesley. Another was Whitefield, who was younger than either of them, the son of an innkeeper at Gloucester. He entered Pembroke College in 1732 as a servitor, where he found that his acquaintance with a public-house was of use to him in the attendance by which, being a penniless student, he earned his living. This group of young men read such writings as the "Imitation of Christ" by Thomas à Kempis, Law's "Serious Call," and Taylor's "Holy Living and Dying." Their devoutness was strongly tinged with asceticism. One of their rules required that they should frequently "interrogate themselves whether they have been simple and recollected; whether they have prayed with fervor, Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and on Saturday noon; if they have used a collect at nine, twelve, and three o'clock; duly meditated on Sunday, from three to four, on Thomas à Kempis; or mused on Wednesday and Friday, from twelve to one, on the passion." They frequently partook of the communion. They visited also almshouses and prisons, and were diligent in efforts to instruct and console the suffering.

John Wesley
and his asso-
ciates.

For the reason that they lived by rule, the term "Methodist" was attached to them as a nickname by their fellow-students. In 1735 John Wesley, accompanied by his brother Charles, went out as a missionary to Georgia. A number of Moravians were on board, and among them one of their noted preachers, Spangenberg, afterwards a bishop. Wesley—whose ascetic tendency led him to take on himself unnecessary discomforts on the voyage—was struck with the serenity of these men in the midst of a raging tempest, when the rest of the passengers were agitated with fear. On landing he consulted Spangenberg concerning the religious work which he was to undertake in connection with Oglethorpe's colony. "My brother," said the Moravian pastor, "I must ask you one or two questions. Have you the witness within yourself? Does the spirit of God bear witness with your spirit that you are a child of God?" Wesley was disturbed by these inquiries, and smitten with inward misgivings. His not very judicious course in a matter of church discipline, where there was room for a charge against him of being influenced by personal resentment, expedited his return to England, after a two years' absence. On the voyage home he was once more afflicted on discovering in a storm that he was not free from the fear of death. Arrived in England, he sought the society of the Moravians, and received much spiritual aid from Peter Böhler, a preacher of that body in London. All his life Wesley had been, as he truthfully avows, in quest of "holiness;" but he had failed to attain to peace of mind. His brother Charles anticipated him by a few days in this step of spiritual progress. But on the afternoon of May 24, 1738, the older brother received comfort from hearing an anthem in St. Paul's Cathedral, and in the evening, at a meeting of a Moravian society, he listened to the reading of the preface of Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

Turning-point
in Wesley's
religious life.

The words of Luther on a free salvation awakened within him a new feeling—a joyous assurance that his sins were all forgiven. He looked upon himself as having been up to this time in the dark on the subject of justification. He connected himself with the Moravians, and made a visit of several weeks' duration at Herrnhut. Coming back to London, he began to preach constantly in the city and in the neighborhood, not only in the churches but also in almshouses and prisons. The unwonted fire which he infused into his sermons, the directness of his appeals to the unreconciled, his call for instantaneous conversion, and his presentation of the all-sufficient power of faith as the ground of escape from guilt and fear, and the antidote of sin, ex-

cited distrust and opposition among the preachers of the establishment. Whitefield's experience, in its essential character, was not unlike that of Wesley. In his inward struggles there had come a moment when he dared to trust to the mercy of God, and found on a sudden that the burden which had oppressed him was gone. He aimed to reproduce in others a like experience. The same year that Wesley learned from Luther the way of peace, Whitefield began to preach in the open air at Kingswood, near Bristol. He commenced the work of field-preaching among the half-savage colliers, to whom no one had taken pains to proclaim the gospel. He began with small assemblies, but soon all classes flocked to the hill-sides where one of the most persuasive and moving orators that ever spoke to an audience stirred all hearts with the pathos of his discourses. "The trees and hedges were crowded with humble listeners, and the fields were darkened by a compact mass. The voice of the great preacher pealed with a thrilling power to the very outskirts of that mighty throng." "Soon tears might be seen forming white gutters down cheeks blackened from the coal mine. Then sobs and groans told how hard hearts were melting at his words. A fire was kindled among the outcasts of Kingswood which burnt long and fiercely, and was destined in a few years to overspread the land." John Wesley's native love of "decency and order" was at first shocked at these experiments of preaching outside the walls of churches. This prejudice did not long continue; he joined Whitefield at Bristol, and began himself to preach to vast assemblies of attentive and excited listeners. He quickly commenced to organize the converts who were made by the preaching. Those who attached themselves to the new preachers were combined in societies. There was nothing at all novel in this proceeding. Societies for prayer and religious improvement had previously existed in various places in connection with the Church of England. These new organizations were of the same kind, and were meant to be simply auxiliary to the Church. The Moravian communities suggested to Wesley several of the leading features in his system of order and discipline. The members of the societies were divided into bands, or classes, for mutual oversight and spiritual quickening, under the presidency of leaders. Wesley, however, appointed lay assistants, and at length gave them permission to hold preaching services. This was another important measure. These preachers multiplied, and the country was at length divided into "circuits," in order that the population might all be reached. The "Foundry" in London was

Whitefield :
field preach-
ing.

opened as a preaching-place, and the number of preaching houses rapidly increased. Then the Methodists combined into a definite organization which was called "The United Society," a name copied from the designation of the Moravians. From them, in 1740, Wesley separated altogether, in consequence of a mutual antipathy which gradually arose. He complained of them for alleged Antinomian tendencies and some other singularities of doctrine, and for certain offensive peculiarities of custom and rite. In reality, the Moravian method of waiting in "stillness" for the grace of assurance, and the type of sentiment, the sort of quietism, which they cherished, was repugnant to the more aggressive and enthusiastic temper of Methodism. Wesley turned his back on them, as he had previously repudiated Law and his earlier guides. It was no part of Wesley's design to build up a sect, or to break in any way the bond of connection with the Church of England. With all sincerity, to the end of his life, he abjured such an intention. Not many months before his death, he said: "I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my advice will ever separate from it." This is but one of numerous declarations of the same purport. Charles Wesley was even more resolute in holding this position. But John Wesley, much to the disgust of his brother, felt impelled to take a course which legally and actually involved separation. He became convinced that presbyter and bishop are of the same order, and that he had as good a right to ordain as to administer the sacrament. He ordained Coke, and authorized him to ordain Asbury, as superintendents or bishops for the Methodists in America. He ordained preachers also for service in Scotland and in other foreign places. He was ultimately obliged, moreover, to register his chapels in order to protect them, according to the provisions of the Act of Toleration. He gave them, by a deed of trust, into the charge of one hundred preachers. He thereby conferred on the Methodist body a separate legal status. To the last he refused to allow the preachers whom he commissioned, to administer the sacraments in England; but this right was granted to them by the Methodist Conference in 1793. Thus the instrumentalities which had at first been created as ancillary and supplemental to the Church of England, resulted in giving being to a distinct and compact ecclesiastical body.

The most saintly of all the coadjutors of Wesley was Fletcher, of Madeley. Born and educated in Switzerland, he went to England in his youth, and in 1755 took orders in the Church. He had

Methodists
become a separate body.

previously joined the Methodist society. He chose the parish of Madeley in preference to a place where there was less labor and a larger stipend. There he devoted himself to preaching and to pastoral work with an ardor and self-denial which have rarely been equalled. The almost angelic excellence of his character impressed itself on all who met him. Southey writes of him : " No age or country has ever produced a man of more fervent piety or more perfect charity ; no church has ever possessed a more apostolic minister." After his death, Wesley himself said of him : " I was intimately acquainted with him for about thirty years ; I conversed with him, morning, noon, and night, without the least reserve, during a journey of many hundred miles ; and in all that time, I never heard him speak one improper word, nor saw him do an improper action." " So unblamable a character, in every respect, I have not found either in Europe or America ; and I scarce expect to find such another on this side of eternity." Among the last words that Fletcher uttered was the fervent exclamation, " God is love ! " He was in full sympathy with Wesley in theological opinion. His " Checks to Antinomianism " is still a classical work in the Methodist body.

The names of Wesley and Whitefield will be forever honorably connected with the reformation in which they took the leading part. Their friendship, with a brief partial interruption, continued as long as Whitefield lived. But after Whitefield's return, in 1741, from a second visit to America, where he had been confirmed by Edwards in his Calvinistic opinions, the doctrinal differences between them made their paths diverge. The career of each was thenceforward distinct from that of the other. Wesley was an Arminian in his theology. The emphasis which he laid on the need of the Holy Spirit, and the fervent zeal which pervaded the entire Wesleyan movement, created the widest disparity between Methodist Arminianism, as a practical system, and the old Arminianism of Holland and England. The Wesleyan faith was Arminianism on fire. But perhaps no man ever inveighed more vehemently against the Calvinistic tenet of election than John Wesley. There was another point in Wesley's teaching which excited much displeasure. This was his doctrine of Christian perfection, which he held to be attainable, and that instantaneously, by the believer in this life. Faith is the source of complete sanctification as well as of complete forgiveness. By perfection Wesley did not mean such an absolute legal purity as dispenses with the need of praying daily for the pardon of trespasses and with the need of

Wesley's doctrines.

"atoning blood" for continued "defects and omissions;" but he meant an uninterrupted reign in the heart of love to God and man. The Wesleyan preaching made everything turn on the acceptance or rejection of Christ as a Saviour. Its doctrine of assurance of hope as the privilege of all, and of complete deliverance from sin, was embraced in its announcement of a free, complete salvation held out to every transgressor. Whatever may be thought of this interpretation of the gospel, the Methodist preacher was always the herald of a hopeful and inspiring message.

Lady Huntingdon, who was possessed of wealth and social influence, became the patroness of that branch of the movement of which Whitefield was the head. "The Tabernacle" was erected, as a place for preaching, not far from "the Foundry." She built a chapel at Bath, and other chapels in different parts of Great Britain. She established a college for the education of preachers at Trevecca. In "Lady Huntingdon's Connection," as the chapels under her charge were called, the liturgy was still used. Strongly indisposed to separate them in any way from the Established Church, she was compelled to register them as dissenting places of worship, in order to hold the property. Her personal efforts were mainly directed to the conversion of people of rank. On some an impression was produced; others were shocked at the plain teaching of the preachers. The Duchess of Buckingham, after attending the chapel at Bath, wrote: "It is monstrous to be told you have a heart as sinful as the common wretches that crawl on the earth. This is highly offensive and insulting; and I cannot but wonder that your ladyship should relish any sentiments so much at variance with high rank and good breeding." A considerable portion of the Whitefield Methodists were eventually absorbed in the Independent body. The "Welsh Calvinistic Methodists" embrace many communicants. Whitefield's preaching impressed all minds. It moved Benjamin Franklin, a pattern of coolness and prudence, to empty his pockets of the coin which they contained, for the benefit of the orphan house in Georgia, although he had not approved of the object for which the collection was taken. It was admired by a cold-blooded philosopher like Hume, and equally by men of the world, such as Bolingbroke and Chesterfield. Jonathan Edwards, as he listened to him, wept through the entire sermon. Thirteen times Whitefield crossed the Atlantic. He finally ended his days at Newburyport. On the evening before his death, from the stairs which led to his bed-chamber, to a throng which had come to the door of the house, out of a desire

Whitefield and
his preaching.

to hear him, he preached until the wick of the candle which he held in his hand burned out.

The Methodist preachers found little favor with the dignitaries of the establishment or with the majority of the clergy. They had to choose between preaching in halls, barns, or in the open air, and remaining silent. John Wesley, being Methodist preaching and its effect. denied admission to the pulpit at Epworth, preached at sunset every day, during a week, in the church-yard, standing on his father's tomb. His preaching frequently excited ungovernable emotion in the hearts of many of his hearers. There were screams, paroxysms of agony, and outcries and contortions of body, sometimes not unlike the phenomena recorded of demoniacs in the gospels. Such demonstrations were displeasing to his brother Charles and to Whitefield. They are such as have frequently attended earnest and impassioned preaching among rude and uneducated people. It was from this class, not exclusively but mainly, that the converts to Methodism in its early days were made. There was not a little which might naturally provoke adverse criticism. The custom of Wesley and other leaders to resort to the lot, or to open the Bible at random for a text, in order thereby to determine an unsettled question of duty, was condemned as a superstition. The tendency to be satisfied with no proofs of piety which did not involve a vivid consciousness of a change of heart at some definite moment, was regarded by many sober-minded Christians with disfavor. The censorious spirit in which those whose temperament prevented them from being kindled to fervor were sometimes judged, was not in accord with charity. In short, Methodism was a great outburst of religious feeling. As might be expected at such an epoch, evil was mingled with good. The merits and benefits of the movement far outweighed the attendant evils and errors. This fact is attested by the reformation of morals and the lessening of crime which everywhere followed in the steps of the Methodist preachers. It would be strange if this great quickening of spiritual life had found no expression in song. The poet of Methodism was Charles Wesley. The remarkable merit of his hymns is indicated by the welcome accorded to them by religious bodies with theological tenets at variance with his own.

Of the two leaders, Whitefield was more amiable and winning in his natural temper, and had no equal in pathetic oratory. Neither in learning nor in fertility of thought did he rise above the common level. We look in vain in his sermons for any marks of originality. The deference

Wesley and
Whitefield
compared.

which he paid to moods and impulses bordered on puerility. John Wesley was a trained man, possessed of scholarly acquirements. He was more of a logician than a philosopher, but the combination in him of qualities, moral and intellectual, entitle him to a distinguished rank among religious founders. He kept before him certain definite objects of endeavor, and advanced with a clear glance, a dauntless spirit, and an unfaltering step to the realization of them.

The results of Wesley's work were greater in the last ten years of his life than in the fifty years previous. When the conference met in 1790 there were 115 circuits in the United Kingdom, 294 itinerant preachers, and 71,568 members. Growth of Methodism. The aggregate number of circuits in the different countries was 240; of preachers, 541; of members, 134,549. There were 19 missionaries in foreign parts. Of the Conference of preachers, Wesley, with his brother Charles, had been the sole director. He had established, however, the custom of taking counsel with them, so that, after his death, they were prepared to become a self-governing body. In view of the effects of his labors, as seen in so many lands, he could utter, without boasting, the memorable words: "My parish is the world."

If Whitefield was not the founder of the evangelical school in the Established Church, he did very much to develop it and promote its growth. This movement has been described as the revival of Puritanism in the Church of England. Among the preachers and writers who are identified with it are William Romaine (1714-1795), who was stricter in his Calvinism than most of them; Henry Venn (1724-1797), who, like Romaine, was attached to Lady Huntingdon's Connection, until her act of "secession" or separation, in 1781, and who wrote the "Complete Duty of Man," a sincere and vigorous work on practical piety; John Newton (1725-1807), the pastor of Olney, whose own experience of rescue from a life of extreme depravity qualified him to give counsel to all who were afflicted with remorse; Cowper, the poet (1731-1800), whose morbid spirit was not darkened, but was helped and comforted by evangelical religion, and by the sympathy of Newton; Thomas Scott (1747-1821), the successor of Newton at Olney, and the author of "The Force of Truth" and of the "Commentary on the Bible," both of which were widely popular, and the first of which embraces an account of the writer's own spiritual experience; Joseph Milner (1744-1797), the church historian of the evangelical school, who composed his work

mainly for the purpose of describing what good had been effected by Christianity, in order that his readers might be edified by the narrative. As a popular writer, Hannah More (1745-1833) had a large measure of esteem. As the eighteenth century approached its end, the Evangelicals became a numerous and compact body in the English Church. A powerful influence in behalf of their cause was exerted by the orator and statesman, William Wilberforce. In addition to the effect of his example and of his philanthropic labors in Parliament, he published, in 1797, "A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System in the Higher and Middle Classes in this Country, contrasted with Real Christianity." The effect of this work in England and America was great, and it was translated into several languages.

The nonconforming bodies, as well as the Church of England, felt the awakening breath of the Methodist revival. In the first half of the century each of the three principal dissenting denominations, the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Baptists—of which the two former were by far the most numerous—had in the ranks of their ministry men of deserved distinction. Calamy (1671-1732) was a Presbyterian, and a leader among the nonconforming clergy of London. Watts (1674-1748) and Doddridge (1702-1751) were shining lights in the Independent body. Few books of a practical cast have been more read and valued than Doddridge's "Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul." Among the Baptists, John Gale (1680-1721) was justly eminent for his biblical and oriental learning. The preaching of the nonconformists still retained, in no small degree, the unction of the Puritan times, although the form and style of sermons were altered to suit the later standards of literary taste. Arian speculations found some favor in Presbyterian and Independent circles. At a convention of London nonconforming ministers at Salters' Hall in 1719, a majority refused—not all of them, however, on the ground of disbelief—to subscribe to a Trinitarian confession. The Baptists were not wholly united on the question of open and strict communion. A great majority were for the latter view. The principal division among them was between the General and Particular Baptists. The former class were Arminians, and the latter Calvinists. In 1770 the more orthodox portion of the General Baptists formed an association called the New Connection. Under the influence of the writings of Andrew Fuller (1754-1815), the Calvinism of the Particular Baptists assumed a mitigated form. The spread of the tenet of open communion among the Baptists

Religion in
the noncon-
forming
bodies.

in England took place subsequently, and was effected, to a large extent, by the eloquent teaching of the distinguished preacher, Robert Hall (1764-1831). Methodism was treated with various degrees of sympathy by nonconforming ministers and churches. The assaults of the Wesleyans upon Calvinism, which sometimes took the form of harsh invective, prevented the cooperation of many who, on other grounds, were not unfriendly to the revival. From some of the proceedings and methods of Whitefield even such men as Watts and Doddridge conscientiously withheld their approval. There can be no doubt, however, that many who were converted at the Methodist meetings found their way into the dissenting churches, and that these, especially the Independents, were indebted for their increased spirituality and their growth in numbers, in the latter half of the century, to the Methodist reformation.

A religious revival, with important features in common with the revival in England, although somewhat earlier in its origin, occurred in America. In New England, as in the old country, Arminianism had widely spread. The teaching of the pulpits was rather didactic than stirring. It was solemn in its tone, but was more an appeal to the understanding than to the sensibility and the affections. It dwelt mainly on the several duties of man to God and his fellow-creatures, and made prominent the ethical side of Christianity. The New England settlers had made it a point to require proofs of regeneration as a condition of membership in the church. Hence a sharp line was drawn between the converted and the unconverted, and this was made apparent in the character of the preaching. Civil privileges in the colonies of Massachusetts and New Haven were confined to church members. They alone could vote or hold office. But this had no connection with the movement to enlarge the limits of the church by admitting to a partial connection with it a class who might not profess to have experienced a spiritual change. The "half-way covenant" was at length extensively adopted, by which the children of persons baptized in infancy were permitted to receive baptism on an assent of their parents to the church covenant, and their agreement to submit to the discipline of the body. Another innovation on the previous system was the reception of unconverted persons to the Lord's Supper as a "means of grace." Both these practices had strong advocates among ministers of an earnest character and of Calvinistic opinions. In 1727 Jonathan Edwards became the minister of North-

State of Religion in New England.

Edwards and "the great revival."

ampton, first as colleague of his grandfather, Stoddard, at whose death, in 1729, he became sole pastor. Edwards was born in 1703. He graduated at Yale College in 1720. When quite young, he evinced intellectual powers, especially metaphysical genius, of a very high order. He read Locke, as he tells us, with the eagerness with which a miser counts his gold. His piety was most profound and sincere. He mingled the keenest logic and the utmost ardor in theological inquiry with a devout and contemplative turn of mind characteristic of the mystic. His diaries record heavenly visions, or experiences that almost deserve this name, of the glory of God and the beauty of Christ. Persuaded that the half-way covenant and the reception of the unconverted to the communion were errors, he took ground publicly against these customs. His sermons were thoughtful and argumentative, yet plain and searching. They were delivered, with little or no action, from the manuscript, but with that manifest depth of conviction and of feeling which has been likened to "white heat." In 1734 there began in his parish an awakening of religious interest which pervaded all classes of the people. The additions to the church of converts, young and old, were very numerous. Similar revivals occurred in other places. At about the same time, there was a religious awakening in New Jersey. In 1739, after a lull in the religious movement, it recommenced. It was in October, 1740, that Whitefield, then a youth of twenty-five, on his second visit to America, having made a tour and preached with marked effect in the Middle and Southern States and in Eastern New England, visited Edwards at Northampton. Mrs. Edwards wrote to her brother in New Haven, under date of October 24, 1740: "He makes less of the doctrines than our American preachers generally do, and aims more at affecting the heart. He is a born orator. You have already heard of his deep-toned, yet clear and melodious voice. It is perfect music. It is wonderful to see what a spell he casts over an audience by proclaiming the simplest truths of the Bible. I have seen upwards of a thousand people hang on his words with breathless silence, broken only by an occasional, half-suppressed sob. He impresses the ignorant, and not less the half-educated and refined." The labors of Whitefield, Edwards, and others were attended with revivals in many places in New England. Physical manifestations—trances, and the like—sometimes occurred while the revival preachers delivered their discourses. Other exhibitions of strong emotion—as tears and audible exclamations—were not infrequent.

Whitefield in
New England.

A leading part in promoting the revivals in New Jersey and Pennsylvania was taken by three preachers of the family of Tennent. William Tennent, the eldest of them, established
Revival in New Jersey. a "log college" at Neshaminy, twenty miles north of Philadelphia. This seminary was the parent of Princeton College. His sons, Gilbert and William, were both forcible preachers, and both—the former especially—co-operated actively with Whitefield in his evangelistic efforts. In that region, as in New England, ecclesiastical division was one concomitant of the revivals. The Presbyterians, among whom the influence of the Scottish and Irish element was prevalent, charged the revival preachers with being enthusiasts, for setting up emotional criteria of regeneration, and for pronouncing unconverted such ministers and people as they judged not to meet this subjective test. The conservatives complained, also, of the irruption of the itinerant preachers into parishes where they were not invited, and accused them of fomenting divisions and contentions. The adherents of this party were termed the "old side." The champions of the revival, among whom New England influences were prevalent, were styled the "new side," or "new lights." The dispute went on until it caused a division between synods, which continued from 1745 to 1758.

In New England, disturbances and dissensions of a grave character arose. "Separatists," who affirmed that they were not edified
Effects of the great revival. by the preaching in the parish churches, formed, in particular in Eastern Connecticut, distinct congregations. An attempt was made to suppress by law these divisive movements. The uncharitable denunciation of ministers who were deemed to be frigid in their piety, and kindred extravagances, brought reproach on the eminent promoters of the revival. Whitefield himself was unjustly believed to be bent on the displacing of the regular ministers of the old school, and the substitution for them of ministers from abroad. Between his first and second visits to New England, various associations of ministers in Massachusetts and Connecticut, and the two colleges, Harvard and Yale, protested against any further countenance of him on the part of the clergy and the churches. He outlived, however, this disfavor, and in his later visits, after the second, was welcomed by many who had before treated him with coldness. With the fruits of the revival Edwards himself was not wholly satisfied. He saw that there was much unhealthy excitement. He found, to his grief, that many converts fell away. He never ceased, however, to consider the movement as, on the whole, a genuine and most beneficent work

of God's grace. Many were of the same opinion, while many, whose Calvinism was of a moderate type, and who found extravagances of doctrine as well as of emotion in the "new lights," held that a preponderance of evil had resulted, and referred to the time of "the great revival" as the "late period of enthusiasm." This phrase was employed by President Ezra Stiles, of Yale College, the most learned man of that period in New England, a man of high reputation and estimable character, but not in theological sympathy with Edwards and with the school which had sprung up under his leadership. Dr. Charles Chauncey, a distinguished Congregational divine in Boston, and more of a latitudinarian than Stiles, opposed all itinerant preaching, and thought that the main effect produced by the revival was "a commotion in the passions."

CHAPTER IV.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE PERIOD OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION TO THE FALL OF NAPOLEON.

THE French Revolution was an uprising against the privileged classes—the king, the nobles, and the clergy. The Church held an immense amount of land, seigniorial control over a multitude of peasants, besides a vast income from tithes and from other sources. They partook to the full of that deep corruption of the nobility which was one of the main provocations to the great revolt. Prelates lived at a distance from their dioceses, and expended their revenues in indolence and luxurious pleasures. The common priests, as a rule, were ignorant and ill-paid. The Church had in its hands the whole management of education. The Church had supported the tyranny of the Bourbon kings. The lack of religious earnestness on the part of its rulers had left an open course for the progress of free-thinking. Under them, religion had wellnigh lost its power among the middle and lower classes of the French population. The Church had helped to drive the Huguenots from the land, and, in this way among others, to deprive the nation of the moral and conservative forces which might have held back the revolutionary party from the excesses into which it plunged. Many of the leading ecclesiastics had themselves imbibed the spirit of infidelity. Some of them were quite ready to doff their robes and to figure as champions of human rights and of the sovereignty of the people.

State of the
Church and
the clergy in
France.

It was the impoverishment of the public treasury which made necessary the convoking of the States-General in 1789. The Church, with its immense wealth, could not fail to be an immediate object of attention. After preliminary levies on ecclesiastical property, it was finally, on motion of Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, all confiscated. Ecclesiastics, it was ordained, should receive a fixed stipend from the public coffers. The astute Talleyrand, through all the political changes that followed, until after the elevation of Louis Philippe to the throne in 1830, continued to play a prominent part. The absorption of the Church property was followed by the abolishing of the cloisters and the release, by legal enactment, of all monks and nuns from their vows. The dioceses were completely remodelled, and their boundaries conformed to the new departments into which the kingdom was divided. Each was to have its bishop, independent of every other. Bishops and pastors were to be chosen by the people. There was to be, however, no rupture of the tie between the French Church and the papacy. To these measures the pope and a great portion of the clergy were naturally hostile. The requirement that the clergy should swear allegiance to the new constitution brought on a collision. The pope, in 1791, issued a bull which put under the ban all priests who had taken the required oath. This bull was not published in France, or heeded by the government. The clergy were broken into two classes—those who complied with the law and took the oath, and the recusant prelates and priests who, with the nobility, emigrated in large numbers from the country. On the 21st of September, 1792, the National Convention proclaimed France a republic. In January, 1793, they condemned the king, Louis XVI., to death. The emigration of the nobles and priests, and the aggressive measures of the foreign powers for the suppression of the republic, infused a fanatical violence into the minds of the ardent revolutionists. The Catholic religion was formally abolished, as being hostile to the French Republic. A new calendar was instituted, beginning with the date of the birth of the new republic. In the room of the week, there was a division of time into periods of ten days. So the Lord's Day was no longer to continue as a day of rest or of religious observances. The climax was put upon these anti-Christian proceedings when a profligate woman, representing the Goddess of Reason, in the midst of a great concourse in the ancient cathedral of Notre Dame, was enthroned as an object of homage. So far were the populace carried in this delirium of impiety. Atheism was sentimental

The Revolution and the Church.

Abolition of the Catholic religion.

as well as savage. In these movements clergymen participated. Gobet, Bishop of Paris, with his vicar-generals appeared before the National Convention, with the avowal that they had heretofore deceived the people, but that hereafter they would take their place among the worshippers of freedom and equality. The wild march of irreligion received a check from an unexpected quarter. In the midst of the Reign of Terror, Robespierre, who was a deist, caused a decree to be issued to the effect that the French nation acknowledges a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul. The fall of Robespierre and the accession to power of the Directory put a stop for the time to meddling with religious affairs on the part of the government. It is a curious fact that the instincts prompting to worship could not be wholly stifled, even when the institutions of religion had been trodden in the dust. A sect of deists, called Theophilanthropists, sprang up, who numbered twenty thousand in Paris, and were found in other cities. In Paris they occupied ten churches. Their creed was the obligation to love God and man. But their zeal soon died out. In 1802 they were excluded by the Consuls from the national churches.

In 1791 the National Assembly had annexed the papal districts of Avignon and Venaissin to the French dominion. The pope, Pius VI., protested against this seizure. He united with the allied sovereigns who were leagued against France.

The victories of Napoleon in Italy compelled Pius, in 1797, to agree to the Peace of Tolentino, where he resigned his title to the countries wrested from him, gave up to the new Cisalpine Republic, founded by Napoleon, Bologna, Ferrara, and Romagna, agreed to pay thirty million livres, and allowed the French to strip Rome of precious manuscripts and works of art. These went to Paris among the trophies of the conqueror. The republican feeling in the papal kingdom was used by the French to advance their own purposes. In 1797 an insurrection in Rome, in which a French general lost his life, was seized on by the Directory as a pretext for occupying the papal territory. In the following year a Roman Republic was proclaimed. The pope was carried away as a captive, and not long after (August 29, 1799) he died at Valence in France.

With the establishment of the Consulate, the efforts of Napoleon to build up religious institutions anew from their ruins began. In all his measures he was careful to guard the supremacy of the civil power and of himself as its head, and to confine papal prerogatives within narrow bounds.

Pius VI.;
the Roman
Republic.

Religious in-
stitutions
under Napo-
leon.

In 1801 he concluded a concordat with Pope Pius VII., in which the Catholic religion was declared to be the religion of a majority of the French people, and as such placed under the protection of the government. The emigrant clergy were to renounce all claim to the offices which they had left. In order to put an end to the distinction between the two classes of priests, all the priests were to resign their places, and to be reappointed. Archbishops and bishops were to be appointed by the government. To them the pope was to grant canonical institution. The rights which had belonged to the kings of France were to inhere in the Consuls. The next year (1802) Napoleon promulgated certain organic laws of the Church. They were shaped according to the old principles of Gallican freedom. Decrees of the popes, and even of general councils, were not to be published in France without the *placet* of the government. As a defence against ecclesiastical courts, there might be a resort to civil tribunals. Monastic orders were abolished. All teachers in the seminaries were to subscribe to the declaration of the French clergy in 1682. Notwithstanding the opposition of the pope to these enactments, he came to Paris, in

Conflict of Na-
poleon with
Pius VII.

1804, to crown Napoleon. When, however, several years after (1808), the emperor went so far as to demand the creation of a Patriarch of France, to be appointed by himself, required the introduction of his legal code into the papal kingdom, the abolition of cloisters and of the rule of clerical celibacy, and required the pope to join him in the league against England and to close his ports against the enemy, Pius VII. refused compliance. As a penalty, in 1809 his states were annexed to the French Empire. A papal bull of excommunication against all unrighteous assailants of the Holy See was issued, and Napoleon was privately informed that he was included among them. The pope was carried as a prisoner, first to Savona, and then into France. Under these trying circumstances Pius VII. maintained his position with firmness. Twenty-seven bishoprics in France were vacant. A sect of "pure Catholics," adherents of the pope, was arising, who were obliged to hold their services in secret. Napoleon deprived Pius VII. of the cardinals, and even of his private secretary. The proceedings of the emperor in relation to the calling of a national synod, which met on June 17, 1811, and reassembled, after being once dissolved by the imperious sovereign, induced the pope to make large concessions. He was brought to Fontainebleau, and was roughly treated by Napoleon after his return from Russia, in 1812. At length there was a preliminary agree-

ment, the provisions of which were agreeable to the emperor ; but, contrary to a stipulation, he published it before the pope had conferred with his cardinals. This called out a warning from the pope against giving credence to the reports relative to a concordat. Renewed persecution of the pontiff was the result, which terminated at the fall of Napoleon and the triumph of the allies. In 1814, Pius VII. once more entered Rome.

An important consequence of the events connected with the French Revolution was the secularizing of the ecclesiastical states of Germany. They were converted into communities under civil rule. The Rhine provinces were annexed to France. In 1810 the last ecclesiastical state was abolished and changed into a grand-dukedom. Cloisters in Germany, except in Austria, were abolished. During the conflicts of the period, vacant bishoprics remained unfilled. When Germany threw off the yoke of Napoleon, only five old Roman Catholic bishops were living. In process of time concordats were concluded between German princes and the pope, and the vacant ecclesiastical places were filled.

In Naples, which was conquered by the French in 1806, and delivered to Joseph Bonaparte, the monastic orders were generally abolished, and their property appropriated by the government. The principles of the Napoleonic code relative to marriage by civil contract, etc., were so repugnant to the pope that he refused canonical institution to the bishops. In 1808, Joseph became King of Spain. The Inquisition was abolished. In 1809 the cloisters all shared the same fate. The Cortes, which represented the opposite or national party, declared, in 1813, that the Inquisition was incompatible with the civil constitution of the country. In whatever part of Europe the influence of Napoleon was felt, the civil authority was made supreme, the authority of the papacy was curtailed and made subordinate to the rulers of the State, and institutions like monastic establishments, specially characteristic of the middle ages, were swept away. The mediæval was transformed into the modern state.

The Roman Catholic Church in Germany.

The Roman Catholic Church in Naples and Spain.

CHAPTER V.

THE PAPACY SINCE THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I : CHRISTIANITY
IN THE EUROPEAN COUNTRIES.

THE fall of Napoleon restored Pius VII. to Rome, and enabled him to resume the exercise of his pontifical authority. He came back, an object of universal sympathy, which his patience had merited. The storms of the revolution were over. The absolutist movement. The papacy now, at the beginning of a new era of European history, was at liberty to elect what policy it would pursue. It is remarkable that three out of the four nations that had conquered Bonaparte, and had thus given freedom to the pope, were not of the Roman Catholic fold. Russia was Greek, England and Prussia were Protestant. Everywhere in Europe there was a longing in the minds of the people for constitutional freedom under the forms of monarchy. This feeling of aversion to arbitrary government was deeply implanted in the French mind. It prevailed in Germany. It was ardently cherished south of the Alps and of the Pyrenees. Unhappily, there set in a strong opposing current in the direction of absolutism. The excesses of the revolutionary period had begotten a horror of everything that savored of republican government. The "throne and the altar" must be reëstablished in their former dignity and strength. The Continental monarchs were united in this sentiment. Russia was bent on putting down movements in favor of freedom with a strong hand. Austria, guided by the counsels of the astute Metternich, was of the same mind. Prussia, after some vacillation, joined hands with her German rival. The Holy Alliance between the three sovereigns, to which the other rulers on the Continent acceded, while it contained a pledge to govern righteously and to promote justice and religion, was based on the old principle of legitimacy—the doctrine that the authority of kings is the direct gift of God, and not derived from their subjects. It was agreed that they should combine to quell popular insurrections wherever they should break out.

The papacy espoused the cause of Absolutism. In the middle ages the popes had been considered the champions of the people, and their protectors against the tyranny of secular rulers and of local ecclesiastics. They had placed themselves at the head of great movements, like the crusades, in which the sentiments and passions of the mass of the people were

The Papacy
on the side of
Absolutism.

profoundly interested. They had baptized and taken under their own paternal guidance the prevailing martial taste and the popular hatred of the infidel. But now there was a reversal of their position. They were utterly loath to surrender any of the old prerogatives of their station in order to accommodate themselves to the altered condition of the public mind and the new character of European society. Their bitter experiences during the revolutionary era, the recollection of the wild excesses of liberalism, the desire to keep down the spirit of revolt in the papal kingdom, the vindictive and intolerant conservatism of the great body of the zealous supporters of Rome in France and in Southern Europe, were so many additional reasons for taking sides with the dominant reaction against the aspirations and struggles of the people.

In the papal curia there were two parties; the one, that of the *zelanti*, led by Cardinal Pacca, was for abolishing the French constitution in the Roman state, restoring ecclesiastical property to its former possessors, and for bringing back completely the old order of things, with all its wrongs and evils.

Parties in the
papal curia.

The other, the party of the *liberali*, led by a sagacious man, Cardinal Consalvi, was for retaining beneficent improvements which, during the period of revolution, had been incorporated in the political system. He had but a very moderate degree of success in this praiseworthy effort. Uniformity of administration was, to be sure, preserved; but the offices were taken from laymen and given into the hands of the clergy. In addition to the mischiefs of clerical misgovernment, the restoration of ecclesiastical property cut off a great part of the public revenue, and, besides, involved the creation of a burdensome public debt. The Inquisition and the Index, the old weapons of priestly intolerance, were again brought into use. In relation to the Church at large, Pius VII. adopted an analogous reactionary policy. One of his first measures was the issue of a bull, on August 7, 1814, authorizing the revival of the Jesuit order. Nothing could more

Reactionary
papal mea-
sures.

signally betoken the altered temper of civil and ecclesiastical rulers. The new Jesuits were of a harsh and fanatical temper. They went to work at once to get the education of the young into their hands. They even avowed the loose ethical maxims which, at a former day, had brought on them so heavy a weight of odium. Another characteristic measure was the publication of a bull, in 1816, in which Bible societies were denounced, and stigmatized as a pest. The governments in Southern Europe showed themselves prompt to cooperate with the Roman curia.

The reaction
in Southern
Europe and
France.

This was the case in Sardinia, Tuscany, and Naples. In Spain, Ferdinand VII. called back the Jesuits whom his grandfather had expelled, and renewed the tyranny of the Inquisition. The suppressed convents were restored. The reins of government were practically in the hands of the bigoted clergy. Intolerable tyranny provoked a revolt. The Cortes obliged the sovereign to reverse his policy, to drive out the Jesuits, and to abolish the Inquisition. The Holy Alliance now interfered. Louis XVIII., against the advice of the Duke of Wellington, marched French troops into Spain and put down constitutional government. The rigorous measures adopted after that event by the Spanish king did not suffice to satisfy the fanatical party, which rallied about his brother, Don Carlos, and tried to raise him to the throne. In France, the Church, by sending missionary preachers through the land, by means of public religious processions and showy ceremonies of various kinds, and by the invention of new sorts of devotion, such as the worship of the sacred heart of Jesus, strove to reawaken an attachment to the old ecclesiastical system. The priests who had taken the oath prescribed by the National Assembly in 1790, were compelled to do penance or to lose their livings. Mobs were allowed to attack the Protestants in Nismes and in other towns, and hundreds of them were slain. This was in 1815. The government at length interfered, but did not punish the criminals. Colleges and seminaries were established by the Jesuits, and these became more numerous in the next reign. The antipathy which had existed against the Church was rekindled by the proceedings of the reactionary religious party. Liberalism in all its forms was awakened to a new life. The brother of Louis XVIII., the Count of Artois, who went much beyond the king in intolerant bigotry, and was the head of the absolutist party in politics and religion, ascended the throne in 1824. Pius VII. died in 1823, and the death of Consalvi followed soon after. There was no barrier at Rome in the path of papal absolutism. Leo XII. was devoted to the party of the *zelanti*. His adherents proclaimed the pope supreme over secular rulers. The Jesuits were favored and exalted. Religious ceremonies, including a jubilee at Rome in 1825, were celebrated with ostentatious pomp. Meantime, the papal kingdom was miserably governed. The most of Italy was under the direct or indirect control of the Austrians. Their troops were at hand to stifle the first outbreak of insurrection. The deep popular discontent led to the organization of the Carbonari and other secret societies, the aim of which was Italian liberty and unity.

In France, under Charles X., the ruling spirits in the Church were zealously in favor of ultramontane views of the papacy, and treated with hostility and contempt the Gallican theory, which it had been the pride and glory of the French Church to maintain. The king was obliged to yield in a degree, and for a time, to the rising forces of liberalism, which was hostile alike to political absolutism and to the control—for example, in matters of education—conceded to the Jesuit reaction. The revolution of 1830 effected a radical change. The government of Louis Philippe put an end to the domination of the clerical party. The Jesuits were deprived of their newly acquired power. The futility of any attempt to reconcile the papacy with the modern spirit of liberty was shown in the abortive experiment made by Lamennais and his associates. De Maistre, a scholar and diplomatist, a strenuous opponent of the French Revolution, but not unfriendly to monarchy under constitutional restraints, had endeavored, in a series of able writings, to vindicate an extreme theory of the spiritual authority of the pope. He founded his position on the need of order in the intellectual and spiritual world, such as only the autocracy of the pope could secure. His argument resembles that of Hobbes in behalf of despotism in the political sphere. The same tendencies were carried further in France by Lamennais, with Lacordaire, Montalembert, and other associates, in the early days of Louis Philippe. Lamennais contended for the extension of suffrage, freedom of worship, liberty of conscience, and liberty of the press, at the same time that he asserted ultramontane ideas of the pope's spiritual supremacy. This strange combination of opinions was set forth with enthusiasm in a journal, *L'Avenir*. These doctrines were withstood by the clerical party. They were condemned by Pope Gregory XVI., who, in 1831, succeeded Leo XII. The journal was given up. Lamennais submitted with reluctance and with qualifications. His associates bowed to the papal decision. The generous, but quixotic, effort to harmonize discordant systems fell to the ground. Lacordaire became one of the most impressive preachers in the French Catholic Church. Montalembert did not abandon his liberality of spirit.

At about the time when the clerical reaction in France suffered a decided check by the expulsion of the Bourbons, the Catholic Church gained advantages which it did not owe to the papal curia. In Great Britain, Catholic Emancipation released adherents of the Church of Rome from the obnoxious oaths which had been imposed in the times of the Restora-

Revival of
liberalism in
France.

Lamennais
and his as-
sociates.

Catholic
Emancipation
in England.

tion and Revolution, and they were made eligible to the offices of state. One of the consequences of the Revolution of Belgium.

1830 at Paris was a rising in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, which resulted in the division of the country and the establishment of the Catholic state of Belgium. Uprisings in Italy were put down by the help of Austrian troops. Mazzini became the head of the republican patriots and plotters.

In 1846, Pius IX. was elected pope. Maladministration under his predecessor had been carried so far that when he died the num-

Liberal
course of
Pius IX.

ber of prisoners and exiles for political offences numbered not less than two thousand. The new pope, an Italian of high birth, dignified manners, and pleasing address, began his course by the adoption of liberal measures. He released the political prisoners and proclaimed a general amnesty for offenders of this class. He authorized the construction of railways. He appointed a *Consulta*, or Council of State, and intrusted the functions of civil administration, to a large extent, to laymen. These proceedings inspired the liberals with glowing hopes. The Revolution of 1848 in France excited the spirit of disaffection with the existing governments in every part of Europe, and nowhere more than in Italy. Pius IX. went still further in the work of providing for his kingdom a constitutional system. The republicans, however, were not satisfied with the continuance of the supreme authority in the hands of the cardinals. The pope refused to engage in war against the Austrians. A popular ferment ensued. Rossi, his chief minister, was assassinated. The pope, no longer able to control the democratic movement, fled to Gaeta. He was brought back to Rome by French troops. This was the end of the career of Pius IX. as a liberal reformer. He, and others with him, had cherished the idea of a union of Italy in the form of a confederacy of which the pontiff should be the head. This scheme was favored in France, even by such a statesman as Guizot. By this means it was hoped that Italy would be united without becoming a formidable power, and Austrian influence could be checked. It was a scheme that fell far short of satisfying the patriotic views of Italians.

The unification of Italy was to be effected under the leadership of the House of Savoy, the final step in the process being the absorption of the papal kingdom and the vanishing of the pope's temporal sovereignty. It is a remarkable fact that, side by side with this gradual extinction of his temporal rule, a series of measures was adopted which led to the carrying of his authority within the Church to the highest

Union of
Italy : loss of
the Pope's
temporal
authority.

pitch. The war of France and Sardinia with Austria added Lombardy to the Sardinian possessions. Tuscany, Modena, and Parma, and also Romagna, which belonged to the pope, were annexed by their own choice. The arms of Garibaldi added to the Italian kingdom Naples and Sicily. Victor Emmanuel, as the ally of Prussia against Austria, secured Venice for his reward. It was not until the overthrow of Napoleon at Sedan, in 1870, that the way was open for taking possession of Rome. All Italy was now brought together in one kingdom, and the seat of government was transferred from Florence to the ancient capital. The result was accomplished against the constant, indignant protests of Pius IX., who was now despoiled of his principality and reduced to confine his authority within the limits of his spiritual office.

But that office he had been able to magnify. In 1854, he gathered a large company of ecclesiastics at Rome, and promulgated, on his own personal responsibility, without the concurrence of any council, the dogma of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. He thus assumed to decide authoritatively a question which the doctors of the Church had long debated, and on which they were not yet agreed. In 1864, he issued an Encyclic, together with a Syllabus of Errors, in which,—besides the condemnation of doctrinal errors, such as materialistic and pantheistic opinions—the ideas at the basis of the modern state, such as the validity of marriage by the civil contract, education not subject to clerical control, liberty of conscience, and toleration of varieties of religious opinion, were solemnly denounced. In 1870, at his call the Œcumenical Council of the Vatican assembled. Seven hundred and sixty-four bishops were gathered in St. Peter's Church from all parts of the globe, but more than a third were from Italy. The arrangements for the conduct of the business, both before and after the meeting of the council, were made by the pope and by the commissioners appointed by him. Whether it was or was not the chief purpose in summoning the assembly, the project of a declaration of the pope's infallibility was at length brought forward, and was supported by the pontiff himself and by those who stood high in his favor. The ascendancy of the Jesuits in the counsels of Pius IX. had long been a notorious fact. Checks were put upon the freedom of debate in the council. Yet there was strong opposition to the proposal. Bishops like the learned historian, Hefele from Germany, Dupanloup from France, and Kenrick from America, strove in vain to dissuade the council from sanctioning the project. Some of the minority disbelieved in the

Papal infallibility : the Vatican Council.

doctrine which the council was called upon to affirm. All of them judged its proclamation to be ill-timed and inexpedient. The minority was large, but finding that resistance was fruitless, and on account of the threatened outbreak of hostilities between France and Prussia, most of them withdrew before the final vote. Five hundred and thirty-five bishops gave their voices in the affirmative. Only two voted in the negative. Unlike previous general councils, the Catholic governments had no representatives in the body. They had thoughts of interposing with a protest during the progress of the discussion; but the situation of France, and the relation of Louis Napoleon to the Church, prevented his government from taking this course. The other powers did not choose to act alone. The decrees of the council followed in the line of the Syllabus, and pronounced anathemas against various types of current rationalistic theory. The main decree was that in which the pope was declared to be infallible in whatever teaching relative to theology or morals he may address to the entire Church.

The German school of Catholic theologians who had been opposed to the promulgation of the new dogma had held a position between the Gallican theory of the competence of a council to define the faith, and the ultramontane view. Their doctrine was that the concurrence of pope and council, the voice of the united episcopate, is requisite for the validity of a doctrinal definition. When a council itself, however, affirmed the contrary view, in concurrence with a pope, what could they say? The bishops gave in their adhesion to the Vatican decrees. Even Hefele, one of the eminent pupils of Möhler, and the author of a learned work on the history of councils, who had exposed the groundlessness of the doctrine of papal infallibility, yielded, after a delay of five months, and gave in his assent. He had said that he would lay down his office rather than renounce to this extent his mature, conscientious convictions. But he was overcome by the dread of schism and of isolation. On the 25th of June, 1871, he wrote to a friend in Bonn: "I believed that I was serving the Catholic Church, and I was serving the caricature which Romanism and Jesuitism had made out of it. Not until I was in Rome was it perfectly clear to me that what they pursue and practice (*treibt und übt*) there has only the false semblance (*schein*) and name of Christianity—only the shell; the kernel is gone: everything is utterly externalized." He had seen Rome, and it affected him somewhat as it did Luther. But Hefele was not a Luther. Six weeks after writing this letter he made up his mind to accept the new dogma.

The "Old Catholics."

A considerable number of theologians, however, at the head of whom was Ignatius von Döllinger, the ablest and most learned of the German Catholic divines, refused to submit. They claimed that the council was not really united, and that the result was obtained by unfair means. Separate congregations, under the name of "Old Catholics," were organized. Contrary to the first intention of Döllinger and his associates at Munich, a separation took place of the party of which he was the principal leader. Ordination for their first bishop, Reinkens, was procured from the bishop of one of the old Jansenist churches in Holland, in which the episcopal succession had been preserved. A like movement developed itself in considerable strength in Switzerland. Several conferences or congresses of the Old Catholics were held. The organization of the Old Catholics was recognized by the German governments. The seceding body called a conference, in order to promote a confederation of churches, which was attended by Russians and Greeks, and by certain English and American Episcopalians. It met at Bonn in 1874, and had for its result the abolition of compulsory fasting and confession, the decision to use the vernacular in public worship, to permit the marriage of priests, and to allow the communion in both kinds to members of the English Episcopal Church. Towards this church and the Greek Church a friendly attitude was assumed. At a second conference, also at Bonn, in 1875, an agreement essentially in accordance with the Greek view was reached on the subject of the procession of the Holy Spirit. In Paris, an eloquent preacher, Père Hyacinthe Loyson, formed an Old Catholic congregation. The Old Catholic movement commanded the approval of a highly respectable body of cultivated men. But it had no deep root among the common people.

In the several states of Germany the Roman Catholic clergy are paid by the State, which in turn exercises a supervision over their education. In Prussia, Frederic William IV. granted large privileges to the Catholic body. Everywhere in Europe the decrees of the Vatican Council awakened an apprehension that the Church of Rome might encroach on the prerogatives of the State. This conviction was strongly expressed in pamphlets by Mr. Gladstone. The ultramontane party, in the judgment of Bismarck, threatened the stability of the German Empire. Hence the German governments protected the Old Catholics, and Prussia passed stringent enactments known as the "Falk laws," from the name of the minister who proposed them. "Neither in Church nor State," said Bismarck, "are we on the way to Canossa."

Conferences
at Bonn.

The Falk laws
in Prussia.

These laws were framed in 1873. Subsequently the disaffection occasioned by them among Catholics, who complained of oppression, and the exigencies of German politics, moved the chancellor to consent to the repeal of the most obnoxious of these provisions. The rapid growth of socialism, and the need of the support of "the Centre," or the Roman Catholic political party, in the Imperial Diet, in connection with financial measures, induced Bismarck to enter into friendly relations with Pope Leo XIII. He chose the pope as umpire in the dispute with Spain respecting the Caroline Islands. He received from the pope the decoration of the "Order of Christ." The Roman Catholics were requested by Leo to lend the chancellor their support in passing "the Septennate"—the measure for the augmentation of the German army, to extend over a period of seven years. German Protestants, with high notions of monarchical authority, may be an object of less dread to Roman ultramontaniam than French Republicans, disciples of deism or materialism.

After the Revolution of 1848, when the socialistic mobs were suppressed by Cavaignac, the dread excited by the violence of this "fourth estate," the working class, opened to Louis Christianity in France. Napoleon a path to the presidency, and to the successful usurpation of supreme power as Emperor (December 3 and 4, 1851). He was hailed as the saviour of society. The clergy were favorable to him. He professed to adopt the principles of the Concordat of 1801, but in matters of religion, as in other things, he was governed by the exigencies of the hour. As soon as he proposed to espouse Gallicanism, he drew on himself the denunciation of the clergy, including Dupanloup, Bishop of Orleans. He was styled "the second Pilate." The government forbade the publication of the pope's encyclic and syllabus. After the defeat of Charles Albert, at Novara (1849), Napoleon, then President, to prevent the complete triumph of the Austrians in Italy, had sent French troops to Rome under Oudinot, by whom Garibaldi and his brave republican followers were driven out. Rome was now held, and the pope protected there, by the French soldiers. This brought on Napoleon the wrath of the liberal party. In the war with Austria (1859), he went to the rescue of the Italian cause, but the Peace of Villafranca left the work which he undertook half done. The Italians conquered for themselves all Italy except Venice and Rome; and Louis Napoleon defended Rome against them. He assumed the part of protector of the Holy See—a part in which he was supported not only by the

clerical party in France, but by all Frenchmen who, on general grounds, were hostile to the unification of Italy under the rule of the House of Savoy. In the closing period of Napoleon's career, the ultramontane party, zealously sustained by the Empress Eugénie, whose political influence was baleful, exercised too much power. The disastrous Mexican war for the enthronement of Maximilian was undertaken, and afterwards the fatal war with Germany. Napoleon was overthrown at Sedan. Then followed the surrender of Paris, after the vain struggle of Gambetta and his patriotic auxiliaries. When the conditions of peace with the Germans were settled, there occurred the terrible conflict with the Communists, in which Darboy, the Archbishop of Paris, was one of the victims of their ferocious cruelty. In this period of distress, France, as on other occasions of calamity and despair, appeared to turn to the priest for counsel and comfort. This was manifest in

Ultramon-
tanism.

the National Assembly of 1871. The clerical party was strong and was possessed with the ultramontane spirit. Without leave from the government, Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, promulgated the new dogma of papal infallibility. Even Dupanloup, after the Vatican Council, became a most active leader in the ultramontane phalanx. He did much to procure the defeat of the law for establishing schools for universal education under the management of the state, and with it compulsory education. After the fall of Thiers, in 1873, on whose superior sagacity, under the pressure of the financial situation, even the clericals had for a while been obliged to rely, McMahon came into power. Under the ministry of Broglie, and then of Buffet (1875), clericalism maintained its ascendancy. Government authorized the establishing of Catholic universities, with permission to confer degrees. A reaction ensued, which grew in strength, until the marshal-president, in 1877, was forced to accept the verdict of the country, and a republican cabinet was formed. In 1880, the measures of Jules Ferry and his associates respecting education were adopted.

The Ferry
laws.

The pupils in the Catholic universities were required to be enrolled, to be examined, and to take their degrees in the state universities. The "March decrees" for breaking up the Jesuit society, and other orders and congregations not recognized by the state, were carried out when Gambetta became the head of the ministry (November, 1881). The school law of the minister, Paul Bert, provided for compulsory attendance at the public schools, and for the complete secularizing of them. Among the other measures of the anti-clerical majority was the law, passed in 1881, giving the

whole jurisdiction over questions of divorce to the civil courts. The destruction of Gallicanism in the French Catholic Church, and the sway of ultramontanism, are owing to several causes. The French Church, in the present century, has not had, as of old, in the civil government of the nation a champion and a rallying-point for its forces. It has turned to Rome as a source of strength. It looks on infidelity, in the form of deism or materialism, as lying at the root of republican movements for the secularizing of the state and the overthrow of clerical control. The reign of ultramontan-

ism has brought with it a reign of superstition. Mariolatry has flourished as never before. The worship of the "Sacred Heart" of Jesus has called out a wide-spread effusion of mystical and sentimental devotion. Alleged miracles, as at Lourdes and La Salette, have been used to draw multitudes of pilgrims to these places, honored by apparitions of the Virgin. Against the ultramontane glorifying of the papacy there have not been wanting earnest, but wholly ineffectual, protests. Montalembert saw in it something wholly different from that non-interference on the part of the state with the distinctly spiritual office of the pope, for which in his younger days he had contended. In 1852, he spoke of "the lavish encouragement given under the pontificate of Pius IX. to exaggerated doctrines, outraging the good-sense as well as the honor of the human race." He adverted to the "incredible wheel-about" of the French clergy in its new devotion to Rome. In a letter to Montalembert (September 10, 1853), Sibour, Archbishop of Paris, spoke "of the double idolatry of the ultramontane school—the idolatry of the temporal power and the spiritual power." Later, in a letter published in the *London Times* of March 7, 1870, Montalembert chastises those who have "immolated justice and truth, reason and history, in one great holocaust to the idol they raised up for themselves in the Vatican."

No body of Christians was ever more entitled to the distinction of being a martyr-church than the Huguenot Church of France.

The ingenious barbarism of Louis XIV. did not destroy it. The remnant of the faithful that survived was driven to worship, almost without pastors, and literally in "dens and caves of the earth." The man who did most to infuse new life into this feeble and prostrate body of disciples was Antoine Court (1696–1760), who was born in a family of pious peasants, had little education, but was familiar with the Scriptures, and had the qualifications of mind and heart which fitted him to be a leader and guide. He became the head of the

The Church
of the Hugue-
nots.

Court,

“church of the desert.” He rallied, taught, and reorganized his forlorn brethren, and when driven from France, in 1730, with a price set upon his life, he established at Lausanne a theological college, whence Huguenot preachers were sent forth into France, down to the time when Napoleon I. set up the first empire. As

late as 1762, Jean Calas, a Protestant merchant of Toulouse, Calas. perished as a victim of blind fanaticism and cruelty.

Falsely accused of taking the life of one of his sons, a Roman Catholic, who had committed suicide, the father, by the sentence of the Parliament of Toulouse, was tortured, broken on the wheel, and then burned to ashes. Voltaire was instrumental in procuring a reversal of the sentence from the king and council at Versailles, and what reparation it was possible to make to the family.

The first Napoleon struck a blow at the Reformed Church by putting down the General Synods. The second Napoleon, it may be added, did a like injury by putting down the Provincial Synods.

In the reign of Louis XVIII., about 1820, a revival of religion, proceeding from the influence of the Wesleyans who had long existed in Normandy, spread through the Huguenot churches. The effect was perpetuated in the evangelical spirit which has continued until now in these communities.

But in the Reformed Church in France there have existed for a half century, and even longer, two parties, the orthodox and the liberal. As far back as 1831, Adolf

Monod, a preacher of extraordinary talents, who acquired afterwards very high distinction, was displaced from his charge by the consistory of Lyons, in consequence of a sermon too conservative and severe for the prevailing taste. Opinions far more advanced in the direction of liberalism than were then entertained, were propagated through the influence of Colani and Scherer, of the new Strasburg school of theologians. The academy at Montauban, of which Adolf Monod was the head, represented orthodox opinions, without, however, any excess, or admixture of bigotry. In Paris, Coquerel was the leader of the rationalistic party. At an unofficial synod in Paris, in 1848, Frédéric Monod, a pastor of rare excellence and ability, and Count Gasparin, advocates of evangelical opinions, withdrew, and then was formed a “Union of Free Evangelical Churches,” about thirty in number. It has relied for the support of the churches upon the voluntary principle. In 1864, on motion of Guizot, a declaration of faith in the fundamental verities of the gospel was adopted by the Pastoral Conference, or unofficial synod. This was the occasion of a breach between the evan-

Revival in the
Reformed
Church.

Orthodoxy
and Ration-
alism.

gelicals and the rationalists, who counted among their leaders Coquerel, the younger, and Albert Réville. The publication of Renan's "Life of Christ," and the commotion induced by it, were not without effect in hastening this crisis. In 1872, the thirtieth national synod of the Reformed Church was permitted to meet in Paris. A short confession of faith was sanctioned, the adoption of which was advocated by Guizot. About two-thirds of the members were on the conservative side. The adverse party strenuously opposed the proceeding, on the ground that no creed should be made obligatory by the synod. The names of the dissidents were stricken from the voting lists. This act, however, was subsequently decided by Minister Ferry to be illegal; but under the new arrangements with regard to consistories, the conservatives unexpectedly were found in Paris to have the majority. In consequence of the division, the government no longer allows the General Synods to meet; but the Conferences have the character of unofficial synods, and are often so designated. They can only give counsel. There are not far from six hundred congregations holding evangelical opinions.

From the year 1830 the "Société évangélique" in Paris, by colportage, evangelists, and other kindred agencies, exerted a widespread influence in the dissemination of evangelical truth. Efforts of this sort provoked, in 1854, aggressions in Strasburg from the side of the Jesuits. The "McAll Mission," provided and supported mostly by British and American Christians, has formed no churches, but has done much by preaching services and other means to make converts to the evangelical faith.

Mazzini and the Republicans had seen no way to the unity of Italy except by the overthrow of all the existing governments, and of the papacy with them. The philosopher, Gioberti, had conceived a scheme, which was approved by many, of a confederacy of the five Italian governments under the pope as president, Sardinia to be the principal secular power. The dream of a papal presidency vanished when Pius IX. broke with the liberal party. Under D'Azeglio, and other enlightened statesmen, measures were taken, despite the protests of the pope, to cast off papal interference with matters of civil administration, and to make the king supreme in the Sardinian kingdom. Cavour, in his maxim of "a free Church in a free State," grasped the true solution of the problem of Italian freedom and union. A scheme, such as Napoleon I. had cherished in 1813, of making the pope a subject was out of the question. In what relation should the pope

stand to Italy and to Europe, and how was he to administer his office as head of the Church, after his temporal dominion should be wrested from him? The answer to this question was found in the Law of Guaranties, by which the inviolability of the pope, both personal and official, was established, and he was left free in his intercourse with foreign states, and in the conduct of spiritual affairs. The Vatican and its dependencies were left under his control. But in order to secure a real freedom to the State, the Italian Government had before it the task of carrying out and extending the ecclesiastical changes which had already been made in Sardinia. The reforms adopted, such as the suppression of monasteries, with exceptions specified by law, and the forming of a fund out of their property for the education of the people, and the requirement of civil marriage to precede any religious solemnity, have been effected, step by step, by the enlightened rulers of Italy. An unusual outcry was raised when the law respecting the monasteries was extended, in 1884, over the property of the Society of the Propaganda—a heavy tax being laid upon it.

The unity of Italy brought liberty to Protestants. After 1848 Bibles and tracts began to be circulated freely, especially by English travellers. Francesco and Rosa Madiari, imprisoned for their faith in Tuscany, were set free in 1853, in consequence of the imperative tone of Lord Palmerston. A Waldensian congregation was formed in 1848, in Florence, and engaged actively in religious work. A division took place among its members, the “Free Church” of Italy being formed by those who were not satisfied with all the traditional Waldensian customs. Luigi de Sanctis, a man of striking ability, a converted priest, was attached for ten years to the Free Church, and then, in 1864, connected himself with the Waldensians. Florence was made their principal seat of theological instruction. Important services were rendered to the Free Church by the eloquent orator, Gavazzi, a convert who had belonged to the order of the Barnabites. In 1870, an assembly at Milan of delegates from thirty-two congregations formed a third Protestant organization, the “Free Christian Church.” Protestantism, under the protection of the Italian Government, is preached within the walls of Rome by several Christian denominations.

In Holland the adherents of the different creeds enjoy equal civil and political rights. This country has not escaped the conflict between rationalism and orthodoxy which has agitated all Protestant lands. The consequence of this controversy was the formation, in 1834, of the separatist “Christian Reformed

The Law of
Guaranties.

The Wal-
denses.

Christianity
in Holland.

Church," which has several hundred congregations. The progress of doctrinal controversy in the National Reformed Church produced sharply defined parties. The General Synod, in 1853, disavowed an agreement with anything more than the spirit and substance of the old confessions. There were three parties which arose: the strict Calvinists; the more liberal Calvinists, of whom the eminent theologian, Professor von Oosterzee, the author of a treatise on dogmatic theology, was a leader; and the rationalistic school, which included in its ranks Professors Kuenen and Scholten. In 1856, all doctrinal religious instruction was banished by law from the schools of Holland. In 1876, the old theological chairs in the universities were by law superseded by professorships of the history of religion, and it was left to the National Synod, out of the fund granted to it, to arrange for special theological instruction. When professorships in theology were established by the synod, and filled by Rationalists, the Calvinistic party founded the Free Reformed University at Amsterdam, which was opened in 1880. The central, supreme authority in the established Church is a small Synod. The control of the Synod, which is accused of a leaning to liberalism, has lately been rejected by a number of churches, led by Professor Kuyper of Amsterdam, which claim to be faithful to the creed of Dort. These have not, however, dis severed their connection with the National Church.

The constitution of Belgium contained the most full guaranties of religious liberty. But a struggle soon arose between Radicalism and Ultramontaniam. In 1834, the ultramontane party founded the University of Louvain, and, with the utmost industry and zeal, strove to spread their system among the people. With the overthrow of the ministry which was devoted to their cause, in 1878, there began in Belgium the "Kulturkampf," as the Germans call it—the struggle with ecclesiastical claims—which has raged in most of the countries, but nowhere more intensely or more incessantly than in Belgium, with alternations of victory and defeat for either party.

Such was the state of theological opinion in Germany in the second decade of the present century, that there seemed to be no obstacle in the way of the union of the Lutheran and the Reformed Churches. The three-hundredth anniversary of the posting of Luther's theses, the Jubilee of the Reformation, was deemed by the King of Prussia, Frederic William III. (1797–1840), a propitious time for this pacific movement. Ac-

Orthodoxy
and ration-
alism.

Conflicts in
Belgium.

The Evangel-
ical "Union"
in Germany.

cordingly, from the two bodies the Evangelical Church of Prussia was constituted. The union took place in a number of Protestant states. It encountered, however, vehement opposition. One of its prominent opponents was Claus Harms (1778-1855), a powerful preacher at Kiel, a champion of Lutheranism, who promulgated ninety-five new theses against the errors of the times. Unfortunately, attempts were made to unite congregations in newly prepared forms of worship, which provoked hostility from a considerable number who were strongly wedded to the old Lutheran doctrines and ways. Such was the effect of the new liturgy introduced into Prussia in 1821. There were secessions of Lutherans, and new congregations were formed. Unwise efforts to suppress this dissent from the recent ecclesiastical arrangements were made, the only effect being to stiffen in their opposition those who regarded themselves as witnesses for the genuine teaching of Luther, and against the erroneous Calvinistic view of the Sacrament.

Under the reign of Frederic William IV. (1840-1858), both before and after the revolutionary epoch of 1848, the Roman Catholic Church was allowed to acquire privileges which, in connection with the spread of ultramontane teaching, sowed the seeds of the contest which broke out at the close of the Franco-Prussian War.

In Denmark, a long controversy between extremely zealous advocates of the old Lutheran doctrines against the latitudinarian system prevalent in the State Church disappeared in the common hostility to Germany, which was aroused after 1848, in connection with the Schleswig-Holstein question. In 1849, the Danish Government placed the principal religious bodies, including the Jews, on an equality as to legal privileges. In 1857, the legal requirement that all children should be baptized was abrogated. This was owing to the spread of Baptist opinions, which were introduced into Denmark and other neighboring countries from Hamburg. There, in 1834, a small Baptist church had been formed by Rev. Barnas Sears, under the pastoral care of Mr. Oncken.

In Sweden, after 1803, the "Readers"—"Läsare"—so called from their custom of reading the Bible and Luther's writings, held meetings, for promoting a more lively sort of devotion than was approved in the Established Church. They were harassed by the authorities, and punished with fine and imprisonment. A change of public feeling in relation to dissent gradually took place, until in 1877 all Christian dissenters, and even Jews, were admitted to the suffrage and made eligible to all civil offices. Non-conformist religious bodies are allowed to form or-

Religion in
Denmark.

Religion in
Sweden.

ganizations. This step has been taken by the Methodists. In 1877, Waldenström, a teacher at Gefle, started a religious movement of a practical character, which has produced a strong effect. In his doctrinal teaching, while evangelical in his spirit, he has presented expositions of the atonement at variance with Anselmic ideas, and leaning towards what is called the "moral view." Emigrants from Sweden to the United States, who are in sympathy with him, have organized themselves in congregational churches. In Sweden, the followers of Waldenström, whose addresses and writings are very influential, have organized many distinct congregations. Although they do not attend the worship of the established Church, nor receive the sacraments from it, they are still, nominally at least, in connection with it.

The predominance acquired by the Jesuits in the Catholic cantons of Switzerland, after 1828 gave rise to the Separate League (Sonderbund) of these cantons, and occasioned civil war. In the new Swiss constitution of 1848, freedom of conscience, equality of confessions, and exclusion of the Jesuits were ordained. But the Jesuits could not be kept out, and were especially numerous and active in Geneva. The Swiss governments were roused by ultramontane encroachments, and engaged in a determined conflict with the promoters of them. In 1873, the papal nuncio was expelled. Since Leo XIII. became pontiff, more pacific relations have been established with Rome.

German-speaking Protestants in Switzerland have shared in the varieties and fluctuations of opinion which have existed in Germany.

In Basel, the representatives of the liberal evangelical school have had much influence. In Zurich, although the people refused to permit Strauss to take the chair in theology to which he was appointed, the rationalistic school has prevailed in the seats of theological instruction. In many of the cantons, civil marriage has been legalized, and the schools disjoined from their connection with the Church. In almost all of the Protestant cantons, the tendency has been to abolish doctrinal tests as embodied in the creeds, or indirectly in liturgical books.

The religious awakening among French Protestants in Switzerland, in the early part of the century, emanated principally from

Great Britain. Among the first to receive a new spiritual impulse of this nature was Rev. César Malan (1787-1864), who was enthusiastic to the end of life in his efforts to awaken in others the Christian life and hope. The bitter opposition to this movement issued, in 1832, in the foundation of a school of

Roman Catholicism in Switzerland

German Protestants.

French Protestants.

theology at Geneva, and in the establishment of a Free Church alongside the national Church. One of the best-known representatives of the Geneva evangelical school was the teacher of theology and author, Merle d'Aubigné (1794-1872). His "History of the Reformation," a detailed, vivid narrative, written in a reverential, religious spirit, has had a vast circulation in different countries. A like movement at Lausanne had to encounter much persecution. In consequence of the radical measures of the government in 1845, a division took place. A Free Church was founded. The principal leader of the evangelical cause at Lausanne was one of the most original and brilliant of the French Protestant theologians of the present age, Alexander Vinet (1797-1847). He was an advocate of the rights of conscience, and of the independence of the Church in relation to the State. His profound insight as a theologian was associated with a deep acquaintance with French literature, and with a skill in literary criticism which has been appreciated by such masters of the art as Sainte Beuve.

In Austria, after the Congress of Vienna, some degree of toleration was still allowed to Protestants, and this was enlarged by the Revolution of 1848. But by the Concordat of 1855 the ultramontane party secured all the power that it craved. Prelates were allowed the freest communication with Rome, and an almost unrestrained exercise of hierarchical authority. Complete control over the teaching in all the schools was granted to them, together with full jurisdiction in matrimonial causes, and censorship in relation to books. The inferior clergy and the laity were displeased with these extraordinary provisions. The result of the Italian war, and especially of the war with Prussia in 1866, was to bring in a constitutional system, which abolished the most obnoxious ordinances of the concordat. This reform, adopted in 1868, was followed, after the Vatican Council, by a complete disannulling of that arrangement. Marriage by civil contract was authorized. The control of education, except religious education, was assumed by the State. In case of marriage between Catholics and Protestants, the male children were to be educated according to the faith of the father; the female children, according to that of the mother.

The most important ecclesiastical events which have taken place in England during the present century have occurred since the passage of the Reform Bill, in 1832. The "Catholic Emancipation Bill," which was passed in 1829, which admitted Catholics to Parliament and other public

offices, was a signal for religious and political movements of an interesting and momentous character. In 1833, a sermon delivered

The Tractarian movement.

by John Keble may be said to mark the beginning of the Oxford revival of the Anglo-Catholic theology, of which Newman and Pusey were the principal authors. An account of this movement will find a place under the History of

Doctrine. After the secession of Newman and Ward, 1845.

who with other clergymen entered the Roman Catholic Church, there arose, in connection with the school to which they had belonged, a ritualistic party. Besides the custom of confession,

Ritualism.

which the Oxford leaders had encouraged, there was a return, in various particulars, to mediæval ceremonies

in worship. These innovations provoked an earnest resistance.

The Evangelical or Low Church party displayed a renewed activity.

In 1836, they had built Exeter Hall as a place for great religious assemblies. The Public Worship Regulation Act was passed in

1874, and under it five ritualistic clergymen were sent to prison.

In general, neither party gained satisfaction in the attempt to obtain verdicts on points of doctrine from the legal tribunals. In

1870, the Privy Council decided that a clergyman of the Established Church may lawfully preach "a real, actual, and objective

presence of our Lord, external to the communicant, under the form of bread and wine." On the other hand, in the Gorham case,

in 1849, it was decided by the same tribunal, against the Bishop of Exeter, that the view of the Evangelicals on the subject of baptismal regeneration might be legally held and taught. Notwith-

standing the vehement opposition of the High Church party, Hampden was made Regius Professor of Divinity at Ox-

The Hampden controversy.

ford, and, in 1848, Bishop of Hereford. Extreme views

held by certain adherents of the Liberal or Broad

Church party were included in the contents of the volume entitled

"Essays and Reviews;" but the opinions there expressed on the inspiration of the Bible and against the eternity of future punish-

ment were pronounced by the Privy Council to be lawful for an English clergyman to hold. Bishop Colenso was de-

Colenso.

clared to be deposed by the South African bishops on account of the opinions published by him, in 1862, on the Penta-

teuch; but their decision was pronounced invalid by the same tribunal. In 1867, a Pan-Anglican Council, made up of bishops of the

Pan-Anglican councils.

Anglican Episcopal Churches, including the bishops of the Episcopal Church in the United States, met, under

the presidency of the Archbishop of Canterbury, at Lambeth Pal-

ace ; and a like assembly was again convened there in 1878. These meetings were for the purpose of conference upon their common work. In 1854, the convocations of Canterbury and York had permission to resume their meetings for the transaction of business. By the Convocation of Canterbury the plan was adopted for a revision of the authorized version of the Scriptures ; and this plan was carried out by committees, acting in co-operation with companies of scholars, selected for the purpose, in the United States. The Revised Version was completed in 1885. In 1861, the first of the sessions of an annual "Church Congress" was held in England, for the public discussion of questions of special importance to Christian people. In its proceedings laymen participate.

The Church Congress.

Legislation in England has slowly removed, one after another, disabilities and burdens resting on dissenters. These changes have been, not in the direction of comprehension, but of concession, and thus tend towards a dissolution of the connection of Church and State. The repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was effected in 1828. After a long struggle, marriages of dissenters were allowed to be solemnized in their own chapels, and to be registered by civil officers. In 1871, the last of the acts was passed by which admission to the universities and to their degrees (except the degrees and professorships of divinity) was granted, on equal terms, to Nonconformists. As the result of a protracted contest, Parliament finally, in 1868, passed Mr. Gladstone's bill for the abolition of church-rates ; and dissenters were no longer taxed for the support of worship which they did not attend. In 1880, the bill was passed which allowed burials in church-yards, "either without any religious service or with such Christian and orderly religious service" as those having charge of the burial might prefer. In 1845, Jews were admitted to municipal offices, and in 1858, at the end of a great contest, they were even made eligible to Parliament. Not until 1833 were Quakers permitted to substitute in courts of law an affirmation for an oath. The disestablishment of the Irish Church by an act, in 1869, which was consummated in 1871, terminated a conflict on this subject which had begun on the passage of the Reform Bill. A convention of clergy met in 1870 to reorganize the Protestant Episcopal Church in Ireland. In all measures of this class, as far as they relate to England, changes have been withstood, not generally from any spirit, certainly not from any conscious spirit, of injustice, but from a conviction

Disestablishment in Ireland.

that the maintenance of an establishment is conducive to the religious welfare of the nation—that it must, therefore, be consistently upheld, and that the Church cannot reasonably or rightfully be subjected to the government of Jews or other dissenters who are inimical to it. On the other side, these measures have been urged and carried on the ground expressed by Mr. Gladstone, that such exclusive claims are unjust “in a divided country governed on popular principles.” Some of the practices which have been abolished, such as the requirement of the burial-service in the churchyards, were repugnant to the feelings of many clergymen, as well as to dissenters; and “their long retention,” as an English clergyman has remarked in an essay on religion and the churches in the reign of Victoria, “is a striking testimony to the strength of the illogical elements in the English character.” It is pleasant to record that acts for the redistribution of revenues in the English Church have done much towards equalizing the incomes both of the bishops and of the parochial clergy.

In 1850, a great commotion was produced in England by the act of Pius IX., dividing the country into one metropolitan and twelve episcopal sees. Dr. Wiseman was made Archbishop of Westminster. The new bishops were enthroned with much pomp and ceremony. The whole country was in a blaze of excitement at what was considered an arrogant aggression of the Pope of Rome. The pulpits resounded with invectives, and the newspapers were filled with discussions and caricatures relating to the subject. Parliament passed (February 7, 1851) the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, forbidding the new titles, and containing other stringent provisions. The agitation gradually died away. The law, says Mr. May, “was a protest against an act of the pope which had outraged the feelings of the people of England; but as a legislative measure, it was a dead letter.”

The division between Presbyterians, and Independents or Congregationalists, in England, in the last half of the seventeenth century, broke down the strength of Puritanism. After the Revolution of 1688, the Presbyterians gave up the hope of a National Church on the basis of their system. The two classes of Puritans, defeated and weakened, naturally drew nearer to one another. In 1690, about eighty Pedo-baptist dissenting ministers of London framed “Heads of Agreement,” consisting of nine articles, and relating to government and discipline. It was not an ecclesiastical compact, but merely indicated the terms on which those who formed it would favor and recog-

The Roman
Catholic
hierarchy.

Congrega-
tionalists and
Presbyterians.

nize a closer union of churches. The Presbyterians gave up the control of a particular church by any synod or other body outside of itself, and consented that each church might choose its own officers. Concessions less substantial were made by the Congregationalists. In the administration of Church affairs, it was to be regarded as sufficient to have the *consent* of the people to the acts of the officers. It was also allowed that a man might be ordained to the ministry without taking charge of a particular church. In the ordination of pastors, the pastors of neighboring churches were to concur. The sanction of the "Heads of Agreement" by the Saybrook Platform, in 1708, was one of the measures the adoption of which at that time gave a Presbyterian tinge, for a period, to the Congregationalism of Connecticut. In England, doctrinal differences arose to prevent the union of Presbyterians and Congregationalists from being effected. Many of the Presbyterian congregations gradually embraced Unitarian opinions. During this century, Puritan Presbyterianism in England was re-established, in connection with the Scottish Church; but in 1876 the "Presbyterian Church of England" was constituted as a distinct body.

Congregationalism in England within the last half-century has afforded many signs of a renewed vigor. In 1833, the Congregational Union was formed. It meets to deliberate, and has no legislative powers. Its discussions have been quickening, and under its auspices valuable publications have been issued. An important step has recently been taken in the establishment of a Congregational theological college at Oxford. The dissenting academies in the last century furnished a good training, and out of them came scholars and authors of repute. With the decline of these academies, the standard of clerical education fell. Among Congregational divines and authors of distinction are John Pyc Smith (1774-1851), who wrote an elaborate treatise on the "Scripture Testimony to the Messiah" and several other works; Ralph Wardlaw (1779-1853), long a pastor and theological teacher at Glasgow; and Robert Halley (1796-1876), author of "Lectures on the Sacraments" and other writings.

A sect calling themselves "Brethren," but generally styled "Plymouth Brethren," found a leader in 1830 in Rev. J. N. Darby, who had been an Episcopal clergyman in Ireland. They first arose in that country about 1827. A distinguishing trait of the Brethren was a separation from ecclesiastical fellowship with organized churches, and an entire rejection of an official

The Plymouth
Brethren.

ministry of every sort. They were, of course, hostile to established churches. They adopted the custom of celebrating the Lord's Supper weekly. They held to the premillennial advent of Christ. Apart from a few peculiarities of this nature, their tenets were accordant with those of most other Evangelical believers. Mainly through the influence of Darby, they have gained adherents on the Continent, especially in French Switzerland. There are, also, "Brethren" in the United States and in Canada. But serious divisions have sprung up in this school or sect, chiefly on questions respecting discipline.

The restoration of Charles II. was followed by the imposition of Episcopacy upon Scotland. The leaders of the Covenanting party were thrown into prison. Four hundred ministers were ejected from their parishes. Meetings held in "conventicles" brought on new severities. The Revolution of 1688 restored Presbyterianism. Most of the "Cameronian" societies, which had steadfastly resisted the tyrannical measures of Charles II., were not satisfied with the regulation of Church affairs under the auspices of William, and remained distinct. Episcopalian ministers who submitted to the Presbyterian order retained their livings. This affected the course of theology in the following period, by bringing in an element "moderate," or latitudinarian, in its character. Under Queen Anne, in 1712, lay patronage was restored. This subject was destined to agitate the Church of Scotland for a long time afterwards. There was a deep feeling averse to the settlement of a minister without the "call" of the church over which he was to preside. This conviction caused the first secession, which was led by Ebenezer Erskine in 1737. From this time, the "Moderates," who defended the alleged rights of patrons, and enforced them, were for a long period in the ascendancy. The wave of latitudinarianism passed over Scotland. The Moderate leaders, of whom Robertson, the historian, was the most influential, were men of high culture, averse to everything that looked like enthusiasm in religion, and were more at home in literature than in theology. Their measures produced a rapid spread of dissent. When an unwelcome minister was forced on a parish, its aggrieved and dissatisfied members would forsake the old place of worship and erect a meeting-house for themselves. This was especially common in large towns. In this period, however, the Highlanders were mostly won to the Protestant faith. With the beginning of the present century, an

Religion in
Scotland
after the
Restoration.

The Moder-
ates.

evangelical revival commenced. The reign of the "Moderates" was in a great measure broken up. Their opposition to the missionary efforts of men like Robert and James Haldane brought on them additional discredit. A struggle against pluralities, which was successful, and schemes for church extension and in behalf of the cause of foreign missions, were undertaken by the Evangelicals. During this period, there were proceedings against individuals charged with heresy, which it is important to notice. John McLeod Campbell, a theologian of rare depth of intellect and of piety, was deposed from the ministry in 1831, for holding that assurance is of the essence of faith, and that atonement and the provision of pardon are for all. Edward Irving (1792-1834), was a preacher who first served as a colleague of Chalmers in Glasgow, and then, by his powerful and impassioned eloquence in the pulpit, collected about him in London large audiences, embracing for a time many persons of high intellectual and social distinction. He was deeply interested in biblical prophecies, and proclaimed his expectation of the speedy coming of Christ. The power of speaking with tongues appeared, or was thought to appear, in certain places in Scotland, and in Irving's own congregation in London. In 1833, he was deposed from the ministry by the Presbytery of Annan. The doctrinal error which gave offence was the opinion that the Saviour took on him our human nature as made temptable and corruptible through the fall. Irving believed that the gifts of the Spirit, and the offices peculiar to the Apostolic Church, including the apostolate itself, were restored by way of preparation for the Lord's visible advent. To his influence the "Catholic Apostolic Church," which cherishes these views, owes its origin—a body small in numbers, but including individuals remarkable both for learning and sanctity. Its members claim to be, not the whole, but a part of the one true Church. In its creed, the incarnation stands in the foreground, while in the earthly life of Jesus it is held that he did everything as a man, dependent on the Holy Spirit. Denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, they still attach great importance to Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as making all believing recipients partakers of the new life of which Christ by his resurrection has become the fountain. In their organization, they retain the fourfold ministry of prophets, apostles, evangelists, and pastors. They look for the coming of Christ to precede the millennium. They celebrate the Eucharist on every Lord's Day, and in their worship have an elaborate ritual and a solemn liturgy.

The struggle against the abuses of papal nage, which entered

on a new stage in 1833, was waged in Scotland for ten years. The most conspicuous champion of the right of the churches to choose their ministers was Thomas Chalmers (1780-1847). He was a man of versatile talents, skilled in mathematics and physical science, an adept in political economy, as well as a theologian, and a preacher of commanding power. Finding that all hope of relief from the Scottish courts and from the British Government was vain, Chalmers and his associates, composing 451 out of 1203 ministers, abandoned the Established Church of Scotland, gave up manse, glebe, and stipend, and organized the Free Church. Houses of worship were erected, educational institutions were founded, missionary undertakings carried forward, all by voluntary efforts and contributions. In 1874, patronage was abolished in the Established Church from which they had withdrawn. The United Presbyterian Church, another Presbyterian body in Scotland, was formed in 1847, by the union of two other bodies made up of seceders from the national Church, viz., the United Secession Church, and the Relief Church, which began to exist in 1752. The United Presbyterian Church widened somewhat the basis of subscription, and professed its belief in a universal atonement. In 1876 the "Cameronians," or "Reformed Presbyterians," united with the Free Church.

Repeated attempts of Rome to bring the Russian Church into subjection to the pope failed of success. Under Vassili III., when Russia, as well as the Eastern Empire, was in a state of weakness and disorder, Isidore, the Russian primate, at the Council of Florence, in 1439, consented to such a union; but on his return to Moscow, his act was indignantly repudiated by king and people, and he was deposed. Once more, in 1581, when Russia was in similar circumstances of distress, Poussevin, a Jesuit, commissioned by Pope Gregory XIII., made a like unsuccessful attempt. But in the Russian provinces which, with Lithuania, were annexed to Poland, his effort was successful. A union was effected with the Metropolitan of Kiev and a portion of his clergy. The persecution of Greek Christians in Poland, and such measures as the espousal by Sigismund III., King of Poland, of the cause of the Pretender, Demetrius, who claimed the Russian throne, gave rise to a lasting enmity between the two countries. Demetrius had privately abjured the Greek faith. The relations of Poland to Russia in modern times cannot be understood without a knowledge of the religious contests that began in the forcing of the Roman Catholic system on former subjects of Russia,

The Free
Church.

The United
Presbyterian
Church.

The Russian
Church.

1606.

and the long rivalry of the two kingdoms and of the hostile creeds. Among the great changes effected by Peter the Great was the substitution, for the rule of the primate at Moscow, of the The Holy Synod, 1721. "Holy Synod," over which the influence of the czar is supreme. The czar thus became the head of the Church, as well as of the State. At the same time, the vast property of the monastic establishments was placed in the custody of a "department" created for the purpose. Monasticism has flourished in Russia. But, having no organization in orders or confederacies, the monks have had no power to offer resistance to the ecclesiastical or other proceedings of the czar. The numerous Nonconformists in Russia, bearing in common the name of Raskolniks, but divided into different sects, are an indirect product of the changes introduced by the powerful patriarch Nikon, who wielded in Church Nikon, 1605-1681. and State an authority which reminds one of the might of Wolsey before his fall. Nikon, like the great cardinal, was overthrown, but was not, like him, broken in spirit. Among his innovations were corrections in the liturgical forms, which, among a people so punctilious in their formalism as the Russians, raised a storm of opposition. Raskol, or dissent, sprang partly out of the refusal to acquiesce in ritual alterations. But it involved, also, a protest against the contemporaneous growth of serfdom, the increase of luxury, and the introduction of Polish customs at variance with former ways of living in Russia. The innovations of Peter the Great fomented the tendency to withstand deviations from ancestral ways of worship and of living. The influence of Protestantism and of rationalistic opinions is also clearly discerned in these dissenting sects. Alexander I. made great exertions to educate and elevate his people. For a time, the Bible was distributed freely, under the auspices of a Bible Society, auxiliary to the Bible Society in London; but this undertaking was stopped by a churchly reaction, in 1826. Nicholas I. (1825-1855) showed no favor to evangelical influences from abroad. Alexander II. (1855-1881) Reforms of Alexander II. cherished the same conservative temper, but, through Tolstoi, the Minister of Instruction, instituted wholesome changes in the Russian Church. The condition of the inferior clergy was improved, and the cloisters were reformed. Missions to Mohammedans and to the heathen were encouraged. In 1861, the plan for the emancipation of the serfs was carried out. Nihilism spread in the latter part of his reign, and in 1881 he fell a victim to Nihilist plots against his life. A party of socialistic democracy had developed itself in Russia as early as 1874. This revolutionary party

had been growing up for a decade of years. Out of this party, in 1875, came the "Terrorists," a secret society aiming at the annihilation of all authority in Church and State. Such was the remedy that Nihilism proposed for the evils and oppressions of government.

It is a curious fact, as marking the character of the times, that the Empire of the Turks has long been upheld and saved from destruction by Christian powers. Twice—in 1832, and Turkey. again in 1840—the sultan was delivered from the attacks of his own subject, Mehemet Ali, from whom Syria was wrested by an alliance of European nations. A conflict respecting the guardianship of the holy places at Jerusalem, between the Greeks and the Latins, was the immediate occasion, in 1853, of the Crimean War. The czar virtually claimed the position of protector of the Eastern Church. The refusal of the Western powers to compel Turkey to adopt the reforms which the sultan promised to introduce in the government of Herzegovina and other provinces in revolt, determined Russia to undertake war by herself (1877). Turkey was overcome, but was again saved by the Western nations, through the Berlin Conference.

The independence of the Greeks was acknowledged by the London Conference in 1830. In 1833, the Church in Greece broke Greece. off its connection with the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is governed by a Holy Synod, which is appointed by the king, but is in spiritual matters independent. The king must be a member of the Greek Church, but freedom of worship is extended to other confessions.

In Syria, a war which broke out in 1860 between the Druses and the Maronites led to a fierce persecution of all the Christians in that region. It was estimated that in Damascus Syria. alone eight thousand were slaughtered. Turkish troops were sent from Constantinople to punish the perpetrators of the massacre, and showed for a while some energy. French troops, also, remained for a time in the country, for the protection of the Christian population.

The Bulgarian Church was subject to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and was misgoverned by that ecclesiastic, who Bulgaria. gave away the high Church offices to Greek priests who would pay the highest price for them, and whose aim it was to enrich themselves by extortion. But in 1870 the sultan issued a firman granting a distinct existence to the Bulgarian Church, and placing it under the government of an

“exarch.” The patriarch, Gregory, excommunicated the Bulgarians, but his anathema was not recognized in other branches of the Greek Church.

It has been the policy of the Turks to permit the adherents of other religions to keep up their own organizations, their chief officers being appointed by themselves in conjunction with the Turkish Government. The great Armenian Church has thus been practically subject to its patriarch. It has stood aloof from both the Greek and the Roman Catholic communions, being hostile to certain peculiarities of each. The “United Armenians,” or Armeno-Catholics, a comparatively small body, own allegiance to the pope. But in 1867, Pius IX., in the bull *Reversurus*, asserted such prerogatives respecting the appointment and deposition of all their patriarchs and bishops, that a revolt ensued. A new patriarch was chosen in Cilicia. He was excommunicated by the pope in 1871, and in 1872 all who refused to recognize the Patriarch Hassun and the decrees of the Vatican Council were visited with the same penalty.

CHAPTER VI.

HISTORICAL SKETCH OF RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

At the beginning of the American Revolution, the Episcopal Church was established in the Southern colonies. In New Jersey and New York, it enjoyed the special favor of the government officials. In Massachusetts and Connecticut there had never been an establishment, in the strict sense of the term. Every town was obliged to sustain public worship and support a minister. There was an assessment upon the inhabitants for this purpose. As the people were for a long time almost exclusively Congregationalists, the worship was of this character. As other denominations arose, the laws were so modified as to allow the tax to be paid by each of the organizations to the support of its own worship. Such an act was passed in Connecticut in reference to the Episcopalians in 1727, shortly after the founding of Christ Church in Stratford, their first religious society in the State; and in 1729 the same right was extended to Quakers and Baptists. In places where no congregations had

The denominations at the period of the Revolution.

been gathered by dissidents from the prevailing system, individuals, whatever their religious beliefs might be, were compelled to contribute to the support of the Congregational worship there existing. This requirement was more and more counted a hardship. It is believed that in all the colonies there were religious tests in some form. Even in Pennsylvania and Delaware, none could vote save those who professed faith in Christ. When the revolutionary contest began, it was natural that there should spring up movements to abolish the religious inequalities which were a heritage from the past. The Baptists, who were outnumbered by none of the religious bodies except the Congregationalists, and who had felt themselves especially aggrieved, at once bestirred themselves in Massachusetts and Virginia to secure the repeal of obnoxious restrictions. A Baptist committee laid their complaints before the Massachusetts delegates in the first Continental Congress at Philadelphia. The support which the Baptists lent to the patriotic cause, and the proclamation of human rights which was made on every hand, won a hearing for their demands, and rendered them, after tedious delays, successful. In Virginia, Patrick Henry, Jefferson, and Madison enlisted in their favor. In 1785, the statute of religious freedom was adopted, of which Jefferson deemed it a great honor to have been the author, by which intervention in matters of faith and worship was forbidden to the State. All denominations were thus put on a level, and none were taxed for the support of religion. In New England, the release from this last requirement, or from the payment of a tax for a particular form of religion to be chosen by the citizen, was accomplished later. It took place in Connecticut in 1818; and the last of the provisions of this character did not vanish from the statute-book in Massachusetts until 1833, when Church and State were fully separated. In that State, from 1780 to 1811, a religious society had to be *incorporated* in order to have its members exempted from taxation for the parish church.

The Constitution of the Federal Government, a government of limited and defined powers, had a strong, though indirect, influence in secularizing the governments of the several States. The Constitution provided that "no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." But this was considered an inadequate safeguard; and the first of the amendments contained the provision that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." The neutral character, as respects religion, of the national Constitution

Secularizing
of govern-
ment.

conspired, with the influences which had availed to stamp this character upon it, to eliminate one after another of the various provisions implying the obligations of religion, which formed a part of the organic law in the older States. The tendency has prevailed to regard legal enactments for the observance of Sunday, for the appointment of chaplains, etc., as dictated, not by a distinctively religious motive, but by a reasonable regard for the comfort and peace of large bodies of citizens. In the legal enactments for common-school education, there has been manifest a growing disposition to cast aside studies and regulations which might offend the religious views or prejudices of any considerable number of people. Courts have held—as in the Girard will case it was declared by Judge Story—that Christianity—“general Christianity,” as distinguished from the tenets of any particular sect—is a part of the common law of the States, in the sense that the Christian religion may not be wantonly assailed, or bequests for the diffusion of infidelity allowed to be valid. This was the contention of Daniel Webster in this case, and it had been asserted before, in the Updegraph case, by the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. But the difficulty of defining “general Christianity,” if one is to go beyond that code of Christian morals which the reason of civilized men accepts from its own manifest truth and worth, would be generally admitted. In the new States, where the constitutions and laws have been framed apart from the traditional legislation and the history which have affected the older political communities, the movement towards a thorough and consistent secularizing of the civil polity has had full play.

It is often said that the effect of the voluntary system is to create a multiplicity of sects. But the statistics show a tendency to an aggregation in a few large denominations. It has been observed that most of the denominations which have had the largest growth are compact in their organization. The Baptists, who stand third in point of numbers, are an exception; but their opinion upon the sacraments has served as a bond of union, and, to a certain extent, as a stimulus to activity. Other peculiarities in their character and history, which will be adverted to, help to explain their remarkable prosperity.

The Congregational churches at the close of the Revolution were chiefly confined to New England. There was so little objection felt by them to the Presbyterian polity that when New Englanders migrated to the West, they joined with no reluctance Presbyterian churches. The growth of Congrega-

Sects and the
voluntary
system.

The Congre-
gationalists.

tionalism in the Western States was hindered by the "Plan of Union" adopted in 1801, which regulated the formation of churches in the new settlements, and allowed a Congregational church to have a Presbyterian minister, or the converse. In New England, as elsewhere, the effect of the Revolutionary War, and especially of the French infidelity which was introduced and diffused in connection with it, was hurtful to the cause of practical religion. In the closing years of the last century, a series of revivals took place in different parts of the country. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, they were remarkably beneficent in their influence. Under the preaching of President Dwight, then at the head of Yale College, a religious revival occurred there, in 1802. This was the first of a succession of similar movements which followed at intervals in the same institution. Dwight was a theological teacher, by whom eminent leaders such as Lyman Beecher, Moses Stuart, and Nathaniel W. Taylor were trained for the pulpit and for theological chairs. The unity of Congregationalism in New England was broken by the gradual rise of Unitarianism in the early part of the present century. A prior drift of opinion is indicated by the fact that in 1783 King's Chapel in Boston, an Episcopal church, re-made its liturgy, excluding from it the doctrine of the Trinity. Unitarianism established itself in Harvard College, and in the eastern part of New England had numerous adherents in the cultivated class. The "orthodox," as the trinitarian Congregationalists came to be called, founded, in 1808, the Andover Theological Seminary. The two parties of "Old Calvinists" and "Hopkinsians" combined in this undertaking. By the agency of the orthodox Congregationalists, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions was formed in 1810. In the promotion of education and learning, the Congregationalists displayed an unsurpassed zeal. Through the medium of other voluntary societies, in addition to the "American Board," they cooperated with the New School branch of the Presbyterian Church in undertakings for the propagation of the gospel. About the middle of the present century, the conviction spread that the denominational interests of Congregationalism needed to be cared for. This feeling gave rise to a convention at Albany in 1852, for the purpose of uniting the Congregationalists of the East and the West. This was followed by a national council of Congregationalists, which was held at Boston in 1865. It was a large and spirited assembly. It promulgated a declaration of faith, which pronounced the old confessions—the Westminster and the Savoy—that had been

adopted by the New England synods of 1648 and 1680, "substantially" worthy of acceptance, but presented a new statement, drawn up in a catholic tone, of the evangelical doctrines. Originally, in New England, members were received into the churches upon an assent to a "covenant," their conversion having been previously ascertained to the satisfaction of the church. Later, and especially after fears were excited by the spread of Unitarian opinions, local creeds were framed by the churches, in which new members professed their belief. Naturally, these confessions differed, and still differ, widely from one another in their contents. The Boston Council occasioned the permanent institution of national Congregational councils, meeting at intervals of three years. The first of them was held at Oberlin in 1871. In 1880, the national council which met at St. Louis took measures leading to the selection of twenty-five persons to prepare a creed, or catechism, or both, "for the instruction and edification of the churches." According to the principles of Congregationalism, no creed can be imposed on the churches without infringing on the right of self-government inhering in each of them. A creed was prepared by the Commission of Twenty-five, and published for the use designed.

Beginning with two churches, that at Providence, founded by Roger Williams, and the church at Newport, of which John Clarke was the founder and first minister, the Baptists made their way in the face of constant opposition. Henry Dunster, a learned Orientalist, the first president of Harvard College, and a graduate of Cambridge in England, renounced infant baptism, and resigned his office in 1654. He spent his last days in Scituate, within the bounds of the Plymouth Colony. In 1665, the first Baptist church was gathered at Boston (or Charlestown). A company of Baptists in Maine, who were not suffered to live there in peace, migrated to South Carolina, and in 1693 planted a church in Charleston. A few years later (1698) a Baptist church was organized in Philadelphia. Associations of Baptist churches were formed. One of them, the Philadelphia Association, began its existence in 1707. Another was established at Warren, R. I., in 1767. These bodies had no ecclesiastical authority, since each church was independent. The Baptists issued, from time to time, statements of their doctrinal belief, to which they attached no binding force. The confession adopted in England, in 1689, is the most important of them. It was the Westminster Confession, modified by changes on the topics relating to the civil magistracy, the Church, and the sacraments. It was adopted in 1742 by the

The Baptists.

Baptist Association in Philadelphia. It deserves to be stated that as early as 1718, at the ordination of Elisha Callender as pastor of the Baptist Church in Boston, the three principal ministers of that town were present. Cotton Mather, who preached the sermon on that occasion, referred with disapproval to the "severities" which the Baptists had suffered in former times. Their denomination grew rapidly after the Revolution. Their principle as to the relation of the State to the Church was advancing to a complete triumph. They did not require learning in their preachers. Each church selected and installed its pastor. As to their ministers, if their lack of education was often a manifest evil, and a ground of offence to the more cultured class, it commended them to the favor of those nearer their own level. The spiritual power of these unlettered teachers sometimes occasioned a feeling akin to that of those who heard the first preachers of the gospel, and with surprise "perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men." In 1765 Brown University was established; and since that time numerous other institutions of learning have been founded under the auspices of the Baptist denomination. The theological school at Newton was established in 1825. Among its teachers have been scholars of distinction, such as Sears and Hackett. Some fear has been felt lest, with the demand for higher education as a preparation for the ministry, the homely vigor and fervor which characterized Baptist preachers of the old time should diminish, and the number of preachers become too small. Such was the feeling, in his later years, of one of the ablest leaders of the denomination, a teacher and author of merited fame, Francis Wayland (1796-1865), who was president of Brown University from 1827 to 1855. In 1850, the American Bible Union was organized for the purpose of procuring and circulating versions of the Bible which should be conformed to the interpretations deemed by the Baptists to be correct. A revision of the authorized English version was made by Baptist scholars, of which Dr. T. J. Conant was one of the principal authors. In 1845, in consequence of the agitation respecting slavery, the Southern and the Northern Baptists separated by mutual consent, and began to conduct their missionary and other benevolent work under distinct organizations.

In addition to the Regular or Calvinistic Baptists, who have just been described, there are several other sects which adopt like views respecting the sacraments. One of these, a much smaller body, is the Free-will Baptists, who are Arminians in theology. Their first church in America was organized in

Free-will Bap-
tists.

1780, in New Hampshire. In 1827 they established a General Conference in New England. The Mennonites were early established in Pennsylvania. There, also, the "Dunkers," a small part of whom became "Seventh-day" Baptists—called, in England, Sabatarians—were planted in 1719.

In 1810, Alexander Campbell, from the North of Ireland, educated at Glasgow, and a licentiate of the "Seceder" Church in Scotland,

The "Campbellite Baptists."

followed his father, Thomas Campbell, to Pennsylvania.

His original efforts were directed to the restoration of what he considered the main principles of apostolic Christianity, and to the promotion of Christian union. He soon became convinced that immersion is the only right method of baptism, and that infant baptism is unlawful. The dissent of Campbell and his followers from some of the opinions of the Baptists led, in 1827, to his exclusion from their fellowship. He formed a separate organization, which grew to be very numerous, especially in the Western and Southwestern States. Campbell taught that regeneration is by the word, or the truth presented in the Scriptures, through which exclusively the Holy Spirit exerts his influence, and that in baptism the regeneration of the believer is completed by his personal acceptance of pardon and justification. All creeds of human composition were discarded. The "Campbellites" as they are popularly called, styled themselves simply "Disciples" or "Christians." Each church is independent, but the churches unite in missionary and other Christian labors. The officers of each church, elders and deacons, are chosen by its members. Campbell was a man of extraordinary talents, and was much distinguished for his readiness in debate. He wrote "The Christian System," and other works. In most particulars the "Disciples" are in full accord with the generality of evangelical believers. They have absorbed a part of the sect called "Christians," which arose out of three distinct movements (about 1800). The late President Garfield was one of the "Disciples," and for several years was a teacher in their college at Hiram, in Ohio.

At the close of the Revolutionary War, the Episcopal Church in America was in a prostrate condition. There had been occa-

The Episcopalians.

sional conversions to Episcopacy, the most notable of which was that of Dr. Cutler, Rector of Yale College, a Congregational minister, who went to England in 1722 to receive ordination. He was accompanied by Samuel Johnson, another Congregational minister, of Connecticut, who was reordained at the same time (1723), and afterwards became President of King's

(now Columbia) College. The Episcopal congregations were increased by the addition of persons who were displeased with Whitefield's preaching and the "Great Revival," and with views of conversion and of the religious life which grew up in connection with it. The scrutiny into personal feelings, and the custom of interrogating persons respecting them—practices not uncommon in revivals—have at different times made converts to Episcopacy. The Episcopal ministers in the Eastern States at the beginning of the war were generally missionaries of the Propagation Society, who either left the country for England or, if they remained, were known to be in sympathy with the English Government in the contest with the colonies. The official countenance given to the Episcopal Church in the central provinces, only made it less popular with all who resisted the pretensions of Parliament to lord it over the American communities. In Philadelphia, Duché was a patriotic clergyman at the beginning, but in 1777 he tried to induce Washington to desist from what he thought a hopeless contest. He was obliged to leave the country, and his property was confiscated. White continued a steadfast adherent of the American cause. In Virginia the clergy often led careless lives. During the war a great part of them left for England. At intervals, during the century that preceded the Declaration of Independence, fears had been awakened, in particular in New England, of a purpose on the part of the British Government to establish an episcopate over the colonies. That Archbishop Secker, and others with him, who at one time proposed such a scheme, desired only the creation of bishops with purely religious functions, is true. But missionaries of the Propagation Society were then active in the villages of New England. What might grow out of such a project, if it were carried out, no one could foresee. There was a dread of the usurpations of Parliament. It was supposed that an Act of Parliament would be required for the appointment of bishops in America. "There was a general and just apprehension," wrote John Adams at a later day, "that bishops and dioceses and churches and priests and tithes were to be imposed on us by Parliament." This apprehension was not confined to the Puritans of New England. In Virginia there was a general opposition to projects of this nature, and on the same grounds. The Virginia House of Burgesses, composed mostly of Episcopalians, thanked four clergymen for protesting against such a proposal. They preferred all the disadvantages of being without bishops to the danger of enlarging the jurisdiction of Parliament and of diminishing the

powers of self-government belonging to the provincial legislatures. Bishop White observes that the laymen at that time were generally opposed to the obtaining of an American bishop. With characteristic candor, this noble man acquits of all insincerity those who had felt political apprehensions in reference to the projects for an American episcopate. He adduces the fact that its opponents laid aside their resistance as soon as independence was achieved. Then the efforts to procure consecration for American bishops in England were warmly furthered by John Adams. Bishop White himself avows that he had shared in the apprehensions referred to. "It was not unlikely," he says, "that the British Government, had they sanctioned an episcopacy in the colonies, would have endeavored to render it subservient to the support of a party, on the plan of the newly projected domination."

The Episcopal Church in the United States owes its organization and its continued life, after the revolutionary struggle, chiefly to two men. One of them was William White, and the other was Samuel Seabury. To their remarkable forbearance and Christian wisdom it was due that, out of elements that seemed hopelessly discordant, union and harmony emerged, and under forms and arrangements having in them the seeds of permanence as well as of growth. The first question was, how to obtain bishops. White, who was a rector in Philadelphia, was an Episcopalian of so very moderate a cast that he even suggested that "overseers" should be chosen who should exercise, without consecration, the functions of bishops. After various consultations, at a convention of clerical and lay deputies from seven States, from New York to Virginia, together with South Carolina, a revision was made of the Prayer Book and Articles. The volume thus prepared was known as "the proposed book." The changes were by no means confined to such alterations as the establishment of an independent American government required or suggested. The Articles were considerably modified, and were reduced to twenty in number. Both the Nicene and Athanasian creeds were left out, and the clause, "He descended into hell," was omitted from the Apostles' Creed. Meantime, the few clergymen in Connecticut had met at Woodbury, in that State, and chosen Samuel Seabury to be their bishop; and he, meeting with political obstacles in the way of his consecration in England, had been consecrated by nonjuring bishops in Scotland. Seabury and the Connecticut clergymen were not in the least friendly to changes in the formularies of so radical a nature as the "proposed book" embodied

Organization
after the
Revolution.

Fortunately for the prospects of union, the English prelates, from whom White and his associates looked for the consecration of their bishops, were not satisfied with innovations carried to such an extent. The omission of the Nicene Creed was not generally approved in the Middle States, and it was restored, as was the omitted sentence of the Apostles' Creed. The "proposed book" was so far modified as to open the way for the English bishops to act. Samuel Provoost, chosen bishop in New York, and William White, elected to the same office in Pennsylvania, were consecrated at Lambeth on February 4, 1787. Subsequently (September 19, 1790), James Madison, of Virginia, was consecrated in London; so that there were three bishops in the English succession. In 1789, the General Convention assembled, and Bishop Seabury, with his brethren in the East, were present by invitation. The constitution of the Church had been agreed upon. The type of churchmanship which was cherished by Bishop White and his associates was quite dissonant from the High Church predilections of the other party. Moreover, Provoost hesitated about admitting the validity of the consecration of Seabury, and was personally inimical to him. This was chiefly, it would appear, on political grounds. Seabury had been chaplain of a British regiment, and a loyalist through the war. Here were all the materials of an irreconcilable, enduring division. But the difficulties, personal and theological, were swept away by the good sense of White and Seabury. Neither of them was an acute or learned theologian, but they brought to their conferences with one another a conciliatory spirit. It was decided that the Nicene Creed should be retained.

The American Prayer Book. The Athanasian Creed, Seabury reluctantly consented to exclude. He seems to have thought that it was in use in the Eastern Church. He was gratified by changes in the Communion Service, that introduced peculiarities of the Scottish Prayer Book which he strongly favored. The "oblation" and "invocation" were made to precede the distributing of the bread. The reading of the clause in the Apostles' Creed, "He descended into hell," was made optional. The same provision was adopted respecting the sign of the cross in baptism. The Absolution is left out of the office for the Visitation of the Sick. "Minister" is in various places substituted for "priest." At the convention, in 1801, the Thirty-nine Articles, the retention of which Seabury had not favored, were adopted with slight modifications, but no explicit subscription to them is exacted of the clergy. It is a question whether they are in any sense obligatory in the American Church. In the consti-

tution of the American Episcopal Church there were to be both diocesan conventions and a national convention. The principle of lay representation was adopted. In the General Convention measures were to be carried by the concurrent action of the House of Bishops, and of a House of Deputies, composed of clerical and lay delegates. In distinction from the Church of England, there is not only an entire separation from the State, but the very important innovation—important from a theological point of view—of the participation of laymen in church legislation.

The happy auguries naturally suggested by the surprising triumph over the dangers of discord were, for a considerable time, not fulfilled by a corresponding growth and progress of the Episcopal Church in the United States. The sale of the glebe lands and of the rest of the Church property in Virginia, in 1802, by order of the legislature, was a severe blow. Madison was an inactive bishop. But under Moore, his successor, and especially after

the election, in 1829, of William Meade as Assistant Bishop of Virginia, the Episcopal Church in that region, owing to his indefatigable and discreet exertions, was revived. He had previously taken the lead in founding a theological school at Alexandria. In New England, Griswold was for many years (1811-1843) an esteemed bishop. But the highest influence in building up the Church and stimulating its extension is attributed to Hobart, Bishop of New York from 1811 to 1830. He

refused to allow the validity of any but Episcopal orders, stood aloof from religious societies in which other Christian bodies cooperated, and in general stoutly upheld the High Church theory. Apart from this sort of activity, he carried an intense fervor into practical Christian work. The rise of the "Anglo-Catholic" school at Oxford naturally attracted much sympathy on this side of the Atlantic. Among the products of what is called the more liberal school is the "Memorial Movement," in 1853, of which William A. Muhlenberg (1796-1877), was the principal author. This was a petition to the bishops, calling for a greater degree of liturgical freedom and for the opening of the door to a wider admission to Episcopal ordination. The establishment of a church congress, meeting annually, for the discussion of questions, theoretical and practical, of special interest to the Church and to American

Christians, is due to leaders of the liberal school. Its first meeting was held in 1874. In obedience to a widespread desire, not confined to any class of theologians,

Revision of
the Prayer
Book.

a committee was appointed by the General Convention to revise

the Prayer Book, for the purpose of enriching the liturgical services and imparting greater flexibility in their use. The outcome of their labors was embodied in the "Book Annexed." Some of the recommendations have been adopted, and respecting many others a decision is awaited. The bishops, in 1886, issued a communication to the public on the subject of Christian union, written in a conciliatory tone, and professing a willingness to make large concessions with regard to modes of worship and on other points, provided Episcopal ordination is upheld.

The spread of the Anglo-Catholic theology and the growth of the High Church party awakened strenuous opposition. One fruit of the Low Church sentiment was seen in persevering efforts to secure such changes in the Prayer Book as were thought requisite to remove elements alleged by some to be "Romanizing" in their character. Circumstances connected with the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in New York, in 1873, had the effect of leading George D. Cummins, Assistant Bishop of Kentucky, to withdraw from the ministry of the Protestant Episcopal Church. By him and others the "Reformed Episcopal Church" was now organized. Its framers disavowed the doctrines of the divine right of Episcopacy, of a distinction of order between bishops and presbyters, of a special priesthood in the Church, of the presence of Christ in the bread and wine, of the Lord's Supper as an oblation on an altar of the body and blood of Christ, and of regeneration as inseparable from baptism. The Prayer Book was amended with a design to exclude these opinions. The bishops of the Reformed Church were to sit with other presbyters in one body. It should be stated that the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in 1871, issued a "Declaration" to the effect that the word "regenerate" in the baptismal office does not "determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament."

Early settlements, which did not prove to be permanent, were made by Huguenot Presbyterians from France, in Florida (1562), in the Carolinas (1565), and in Nova Scotia (1604). A large emigration of Huguenots to South Carolina took place in 1685. Huguenot names are among those most distinguished in the history of that State. But in New England, in New York, and in the Carolinas, most of the French Protestants united with the churches already formed by Congregationalists, Episcopalians, or Presbyterians, of British origin. In the seventeenth century, a considerable number of English-speaking Presbyterians emigrated to

The Reformed
Episcopal
Church.

The Presby-
terians.

New England, but found no difficulty in uniting with the Congregational churches as they were then constituted. The government of the Congregational churches in Connecticut, after 1708, was semi-Presbyterian in its character. Churches formed by Connecticut people on Long Island eventually became Presbyterian. Most of the Presbyterian emigrants from Scotland and Ireland, in the Caroline period, settled in East and West Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland. In 1683, Rev. Francis Mackemie was sent from the North of Ireland, as a missionary, and took up his abode in Maryland. The first presbytery was organized in Philadelphia, in 1705, and the first synod, composed of three presbyteries, was formed in 1716. In 1729 the synod passed

The Adopt-
ing Act.

"The Adopting Act," by which the Westminster Confession was taken, as regards "all the essential and necessary articles," as the standard of doctrine and polity. Facts in Presbyterian history during the last century, including the divisions consequent on the "Great Revival," have already been related.

Prior to the Revolution, the Presbyterian Church had made a steady progress. Its members were generally earnest defenders of the cause of American liberty. John Witherspoon, a

Witherspoon.

native of Scotland, an accomplished divine, and President of Princeton College, was a strong advocate of the Declaration of Independence, being a member of the Congress which passed it, and was afterwards influential in public affairs. After the end of the war, four synods were formed out of the sixteen presbyteries which then existed; and in the next year (1789), the first General Assembly was convened at Philadelphia.

First General
Assembly.

There the constitution of the national Presbyterian Church was framed. The Westminster creeds were adopted, with a few alterations, almost exclusively on points relating to civil government and the duties of the magistracy. Near the end of the century, an extensive revival in Kentucky and Tennessee added much to the strength of the denomination, but gave occasion, at the same time, to a division, and to the rise of the "Cumberland Presbyterians." The "Plan of Union" with the Congregationalists, agreed upon in 1801, was a means of promoting the spread of Presbyterianism in New York, and in the States north of the

Division of
"Old School"
and "New
School."

Ohio. Doctrinal disagreements gradually arose between the churches and presbyteries which had sprung predominantly from the Scottish and Irish elements in the Church, and those which were imbued with the modified Calvinism of New England. The former were strictly wedded to the Presby-

terian polity, and were opposed to such forms of cooperation with Congregationalists and others, as were exemplified in the "Plan of Union," and in the societies for the propagation of the gospel at home and abroad. To these doctrinal and ecclesiastical differences, a new source of contention was added by the progress of the anti-slavery agitation in the country, which mingled its influence in the debates and proceedings of the general assemblies. Much controversy was connected with attempts to convict of heresy Albert Barnes, George Duffield, and Lyman Beecher, distinguished ministers holding the "New School" opinions. The result was, that in 1838 there was a division, and two assemblies were organized. Very prominent among the theologians in the "Old School" branch were the professors in the Princeton Theological Seminary, which had been established in 1812, by whom the "Biblical Repository," a theological review, was published. The Union Theological Seminary, founded in 1836, in New York, was one of the leading institutions in which the moderate Calvinism of the "New School" was inculcated. There Dr. Edward Robinson, best known for his works on the geography of Palestine, held the chair of Biblical Literature from 1837 until his death in 1863. He edited a learned theological quarterly, the "Biblical Repository." Auburn Seminary, established in 1820, was in sympathy with the "New School." On the eve of the war, in 1862, the Old School Assembly was divided, and the Southern Presbyterian Church was constituted. Among Northern Presbyterians, the old issues in controversy were obsolescent. A conciliatory and catholic spirit had come to prevail, so that in 1869 a reunion was effected, and in May, 1870, the Reunion. first reunited assembly held its meeting at Philadelphia. The organization of the Church for prosecuting missionary and other Christian work was perfected by the union, in boards and commissions, of both of the formerly dissevered branches.

The Cumberland Presbyterian Church arose in circumstances connected with the revival which began in Kentucky in 1797. Objection was made to the ordination, in that State, by the Cumberland Presbytery, of men whose education was thought to be defective. The differences, thus arising, caused, in 1810, the reorganization of this presbytery, which had been dissolved by the higher judicatory of the Church. The new denomination excluded from its creed the Calvinistic doctrines of predestination and limited atonement; but in other respects adhered to the Westminster symbols. It has become a flourishing body.

The "United Presbyterian Church" of North America is the

The Cumberland Presbyterians.

product of a combination of the "Associate Reformed" and the "Associate" Churches. The "Associate Reformed" had itself arisen from the union of two small bodies, offshoots of the Presbyterianism of Scotland and Ireland. One of them was composed of a number of so-called "Associate churches;" the other, the "Reformed Presbyterians," had consisted of emigrants from Scotland who were dissatisfied with the settlement of 1688, as giving too much power to the State over the Church. The union referred to, giving rise to the "Associate Reformed Church," took place in 1782. John M. Mason, one of the most powerful preachers whom America has produced, was a leading divine in this church, and became a professor in a theological school which it founded in New York in 1804. The remnant of "Associate Presbyterians" who, in 1782, had stood aloof from the union, remained distinct until 1858, when they, too, joined with the "Associate Reformed" in the "United Presbyterian" body. But a remnant of the "Associate Reformed," that did not join in the union of 1782 is perpetuated in the "Reformed Presbyterian Church of America." A separated branch of this sect have strongly objected to the Constitution of the United States as infidel, in consequence of its omission of any explicit recognition of the being of God and the obligations of religion, and have, therefore, declined to exercise the right of suffrage.

The term "Reformed" was used in America, as in Europe, to designate the Calvinistic division of Protestants. It was applied, as is seen above, to more than one denomination of British origin. It formed, also, a part of the title of Calvinistic bodies composed originally of emigrants from Holland and from Germany. Of the latter, the "German Reformed," we shall soon speak. The former, which was formed by Christians from Holland, was originally styled the "Dutch Reformed Church." Its proper name is now the "Reformed Church in America." It is one of the oldest and most

respectable religious denominations in America. It was planted in New Amsterdam (New York) by the first settlers. Its first church was formed there in 1628.

For a long time its ministers were sent over from Holland. This circumstance, in connection with the long-continued use of the Dutch language in divine service, retarded the growth of this body, which had in it many sources of strength. It was slow in securing a united organization under a system of self-management. Its organization includes the classis, the particular synod, and the general synod, and resembles that of the Reformed Church in Hol-

The United
Presbyterian
Church.

The Reformed
Church in
America.

land. While it adopts the Belgic Confession, and the Creed of Dort, its principal symbol is the Heidelberg Catechism. Rutgers College, its principal literary institution, was founded in 1770. In 1867, the term "Dutch" was dropped by a formal act from the title by which the denomination up to that time had been known.

In the seventeenth century, Lutherans came over to New York from Holland, and from Sweden to the banks of the Delaware.

The Luther-
ans. In 1710, four thousand Lutherans, driven from the Palatinate, were assisted by Queen Anne to emigrate to New York, Pennsylvania, and South Carolina. In 1734, another band of Lutheran exiles from Salzburg settled in Georgia. There was a considerable number of Lutheran Christians in different parts of the country, but they had come without pastors, had no stable organization, and were obliged to depend on school-teachers and other laymen to conduct their religious meetings. Persons, some of whom were loose or irregular in their conduct, would occasionally assume to exercise clerical functions. At length, in 1742, in consequence of an interest felt in them by the Lutheran chaplain at London and by managers of the institution established by

Mühlenberg. Francke, at Halle, Henry Melchior Mühlenberg, a minister of admirable qualifications for effective service, was sent over. Two of the three congregations—one of which was in Philadelphia—which were specially committed to his charge, he found to be in a disorderly and divided state. He was, moreover, immediately brought into conflict with Zinzendorf and other Moravians. They were inclined at first to look on him as an intruder into a field which belonged to them. To his unwearied industry and unfeigned religious fervor, which were blended with high intellectual gifts, the Lutherans were indebted for their organization. Under his leadership, the first Lutheran synod was formed at Philadelphia, in 1748. In 1787, the year of Mühlenberg's death, Franklin College in Pennsylvania was established, and his son was made the first president. Two of his sons served in the American revolutionary army. Several thousand Hessians remained after the end of the war, and attached themselves to the Lutheran Church. For a considerable period there was a lack of prosperous growth in this denomination, one reason of which was the determination of the more conservative portion to retain the German language, while a great number wished to have their children

The General
Synod. familiar with English, and to have religious services in the English tongue. A promising event was the forming, in 1820, of the General Synod of American Lutherans. Numerous

institutions and benevolent societies were founded. The great and increasing influx of emigrants gave rise to diversities of religious opinion. A rupture, on doctrinal grounds, in 1864, led to the

The General Council. formation of another great Lutheran organization, the "General Council," which held its first meeting in 1867.

It was to be composed of strict adherents of the Augsburg Confession. One of the leading members of this branch of the Lutherans was an eminent teacher and author, Charles P. Krauth. The demand for a still more strict adhesion to the Lutheran standards

The Synodical Conference. caused the establishment, in 1872, of a third body, the "Lutheran Synodical Conference." Its members were very numerous in Missouri. Many had come over from

Saxony with a strong attachment to the old Lutheran orthodoxy.

In addition to these three divisions, there arose, at the beginning of the civil war, the General Synod of the Southern States, composed of Lutherans who withdrew from fellowship with their brethren in the North. In the Lutheran churches there has been a decided and growing preference for the liturgical forms so long in use in Germany. Their polity may be described in general as containing a mixture of Congregational with Presbyterian elements.

The German Reformed Church—the "Reformed Church in the United States"—was mostly composed, at the beginning, of exiles

The German Reformed Church. from the Palatinate, who generally planted themselves in Pennsylvania. The first *cœtus*, or synod, was formed in 1747. Its proceedings were always sent for revision

to the classis at Amsterdam, since, like the Dutch Reformed Church, it stood in a subordinate relation to the Church in Holland. Emigration went on, but comparatively few ministers attended the new-comers. In 1773 the *cœtus* dissolved its connection with the Amsterdam classis. For the next thirty years, the American Church, now independent, received large accessions, but was less prosperous as regards orderly administration and the education of its ministers. It was infected, moreover, to some extent with rationalistic opinions which were brought in from Germany. A reaction followed, and a theological seminary was founded in 1825, which, ten years later, was placed at Mercersburg. There, in 1836, Marshall College was established. In this college, F. A. Rauch, an able teacher in philosophy, was the first president. In 1840, John W. Nevin became the Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the seminary, and the second president of the college. There Philip Schaff began his important labors as a teacher and writer in Church history. After a time, a commotion was excited by what

was termed the "Mercersburg theology," in the group of learned expositors of which Nevin was the most conspicuous. The Mercersburg theology. Into the Heidelberg Catechism, the creed of the German Reformed Church, there had flowed influences from the school of Melancthon, the character of which may be described, in somewhat vague terms, as churchly and sacramental, in conjunction with influences from a more defined, yet not rigid, type of Calvinism. In the writings of the Mercersburg school, the former of these two elements, that which emanated from Melancthon, was once more brought into the foreground. A central position in the system was given to the Divine-human person of Christ, by whom, it was taught, not only reconciliation, but a new spiritual life is introduced into the race, which in the first Adam fell from God. In the room of a sharp antagonism to the conceptions of the Church of Rome, there was an endeavor to appropriate the truth embodied in them, yet with no surrender of the distinctive principles of the Reformation. The sacraments, it was insisted, are pledges of forgiveness, and vehicles, as well as signs, of grace. In connection with this teaching, there was a revival of liturgical worship. An Order of Worship, prepared by Schaff and others, was introduced for optional use in the churches. Great importance was attached to training in the Church, in contrast with what has been styled "the spasmodic revival system."

There were German fugitives from the Palatinate who settled in Ireland, and there embraced Methodism. A company of these The Methodists. emigrated to New York. Among them was Philip Embury, a class-leader and local preacher. In compliance with the urgent exhortation of one of their number, a pious woman named Barbara Heck, he resumed, in 1766, the work of preaching to his fellow-emigrants. He found an unexpected assistant in a British officer, Captain Thomas Webb, whom Wesley had licensed as a local preacher. Not far from the same time, another local preacher from Ireland, Robert Strawbridge, formed a Methodist society and organized classes in Maryland. In 1771, Wesley sent over Francis Asbury, to act as superintendent, who was soon followed by Thomas Rankin, to whom he became an assistant. The work of planting the Wesleyan teaching was auspiciously begun in different quarters, when the War of the Revolution broke out. The Methodist missionaries were naturally objects of suspicion. In June, 1775, Wesley wrote to the English premier and the colonial secretary to dissuade them from the use of force against the Americans, although he professed himself in his letter "a High Churchman, the son of a High

Churchman," bred up from childhood "in the highest notions of passive obedience and non-resistance." But soon after, he was impressed by Dr. Johnson's anti-American pamphlet, "Taxation no Tyranny," and came out himself with a pamphlet which was hardly more than an abridgment of it. He instructed his preachers in America, however, to observe a strict neutrality, and this advice Asbury and others followed. But such a position could not fail to subject them to obloquy and threatening, and even to occasional violence. The Episcopal Church was so broken up that it was difficult during the war for the Methodist converts to receive the Sacrament from that source. Asbury was opposed to the administration of the Lord's Supper by the Methodist preachers; but Strawbridge could not be controlled in this particular. The close

Coke sent
over as
bishop.

of the Revolution brought relief. In 1784, Wesley ordained Thomas Coke as superintendent or bishop, and after his arrival in America, he consecrated Asbury to the same office. Coke did not abide permanently in this country, although he visited it nine times. After a laborious career, he died on his way to Ceylon, whither he was going to found a mission. In December, 1784, a general conference, attended by sixty ministers, was held in Baltimore. There the choice of Coke and Asbury was

The Creed.

confirmed, and a creed, composed by Wesley and consisting of Twenty-five Articles, was accepted. It was framed on the basis of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Church. The Augustinian or Calvinistic features of doctrine are omitted; there is a careful avoidance of phraseology which might be thought by some indirectly to favor the idea of "baptismal regeneration," to which Wesley had been formerly attached, and which, perhaps, he never explicitly disavowed; but Wesley's own views as to the witness of the Spirit and Christian perfection are not introduced. The question arises whether it was expected that all who join the Methodist societies should believe in this creed. In the "General Rules of the United Societies," which Wesley, in connection with his brother, published in 1743, there is no dogmatic requisite for membership presented. The only qualifications are the desire to be saved, and particulars of Christian conduct. All his life, Wesley asserted that nothing was to be demanded of members but "a real desire to save their souls." For preachers, an agreement was required with Wesley's "Notes on the New Testament," and with a portion of his "Sermons." Stevens, in his thorough works on the history of Methodism, concludes that the Articles adopted at Baltimore are applicable to the clergy

alone. It should be remarked, however, that Wesley left the Apostles' Creed in the Baptismal Office.

The way was now open, under the leadership of Asbury, for the complete organization of Methodism, with its rule of itinerancy for all classes of ministers, its class system, its local conferences, and its General Conference for the entire country. Asbury survived until 1816. He had received in his youth but little education, for he had begun to preach at the age of sixteen. But he acquired some knowledge of Greek and Hebrew ; and his native sagacity and clearness of intellect went far towards making up for deficiencies in early training. In addition to his capacity as a preacher, he had a power of command and a genius for organization which had been quickened by his intercourse with Wesley. Asbury's life would involve a history of American Methodism for the first half-century of its being. He travelled incessantly ; journeying, it is said, on an average, six thousand miles a year. He ordained upwards of four thousand preachers. By him and his co-laborers the gospel was carried into the scattered abodes of the pioneers in the Western communities, and was received by a multitude whom no other agency would have reached. The records of the journeyings and the toils of the Methodist preachers remind one vividly of the apostles and their helpers, and of the perils through which they passed in the first age of Christianity. Their Church organization was so complete that nothing which was once gained was lost. In process of time, numerous academies and colleges grew up, and a great establishment for the publication of books—the "Book Concern," begun in 1789—was established. In the pulpit, along with the rude but effective eloquence of thousands of more obscure preachers, were heard the voices of revival orators such as Summerfield (1798-1825), and Maffit (1794-1850), and of powerful reasoners like Stephen Olin (1797-1851). Theological schools were planted, and Methodist scholars have made valuable contributions to theological literature. In 1872, lay representation was introduced into the General Conference. In 1845, the Methodist Church was divided by the slavery controversy, and the Southern Church was separately organized. This rupture was one of the grave omens that preceded the American Civil War.

Of the minor Methodist bodies, the "Protestant Methodist Church" is the most numerous. This was organized in 1830, in consequence of a desire of a fraction of the local preachers and of laymen to be admitted to a share in the ecclesiastical government of the whole denomination, and

The Protestant Methodists.

of a dislike of the power exercised by the episcopate, which, in the new organization, was abolished. Its creed is not different from that of the principal Methodist body.

The "United Brethren" are a religious organization having a near affinity to the Methodists. Its founder was Philip William Otterbein, a missionary of the German Reformed Church, and a native of Germany, who came to America in 1752. While preaching at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, an awakening in his own mind of religious fervor, which he felt to be really a new birth, moved him to hold meetings in different places. Among the attendants from different denominations there came, on one of these occasions, Martin Boehm, a Mennonite preacher, who delivered an impressive discourse. At the close of his sermon, Otterbein grasped his hand in token of fraternal fellowship, saying: "We are brethren." This suggested the name of the Church, which, by their joint labors, acquired a stable form. Lay preachers were commissioned by them. The "United Brethren" are Arminian in their creed, and their organization resembles that of the Methodists. They elect their bishops for a limited term of years. They have been strenuous opponents of slavery. They have not been wanting in active exertions for the building up of institutions of learning and the diffusion of religious knowledge.

In 1740, the Moravians settled in Pennsylvania, where they founded three towns, of which Bethlehem, the seat of a college and theological institution, is the best known. They established another centre in Salem, North Carolina. Since 1844, the rule excluding non-Moravians from their towns has been entirely abandoned in America. The three houses for the unmarried—the brothers', the sisters', and the widows' houses—no longer exist in this country. They have bishops who are exclusively empowered to ordain. A general synod meets every ten years at Herrnhut; but America is a separate province, with two districts, each having a Provincial Elders' Conference, which attends to the concerns of the Church within its limits. The episcopal system is not diocesan. The Moravian worship is liturgical.

A very important event relating to the history of the Society of Friends was their separation, in 1827, into two divisions. Elias Hicks (1748-1830), a popular preacher among the Quakers, leaned in his teaching to Unitarian opinions respecting the person of Christ and the atonement. A wide-spread controversy arose, which resulted in the formation, by about one-third of the society, of a distinct body, generally called "Hicksite Quakers,"

while the remainder, adhering to the old views, are called the "orthodox."

The congregations of the Friends are connected in the monthly, quarterly, and yearly meetings, delegates being sent from the lower to the higher assemblies. Those who give evidence of a call of the Spirit to preach are recognized as ministers. The activity of the Friends in the education of the young, in behalf of morality, and in labors of philanthropy, has been much beyond what is usual in religious bodies having so small a membership.

When American Independence was declared, there were few Roman Catholics outside of Maryland and Pennsylvania. In Maryland there were sixteen thousand, and in Pennsylvania about half of that number. After the Revolution, the laws which, in many of the colonies, restricted their civil privileges, gradually disappeared. The law which had somehow found its way into the statute-book of Rhode Island, forbidding them to vote, was repealed in 1784. The first Roman Catholic bishop in America was John Carroll (1735-1815), a native of Maryland, who was educated in France, and had lived many years abroad. The see was established in 1789. Carroll was consecrated in England. He assumed the title of Bishop of Baltimore, and was made an archbishop shortly before his death. He was a man of learning, and was held in just esteem for his moral excellence. The first Bishop of Boston was Cheverus (1768-1836), a Frenchman, and a curate in France, who joined the Catholic mission in Boston in 1795, and after performing a very important work for his Church in New England, where he enjoyed the esteem of many Protestants, was recalled to France in 1823, and was advanced, near the end of his life, to the rank of a cardinal. Baltimore was made a metropolitan see in 1808. The first provincial council was held in that city in 1829. The progress of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States is owing to the vast immigration of members of that body from foreign countries. The American converts from Protestantism have not been very numerous. Among them have been some clergymen, and of these, one bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Bishop Ives, of North Carolina (1852). One of the most brilliant of the American converts to the Church of Rome was Orestes A. Brownson (1803-1876). His early education was defective. His mind was exceedingly active and speculative. He was an enthusiastic student of French and German philosophy, and wrote, with much vigor of style and originality, on political and social subjects, as well as on theology.

From a skeptical position he passed over, in 1844, to the Church of Rome, which he defended for many years in his "Quarterly Review." A noted polemic, as well as efficient person in the administration of the episcopal office, was John Hughes (1798-1864), the first Catholic archbishop of New York. A landmark in the annals of the Roman Catholics in the United States was the assembling of a National Plenary Council at Baltimore, in 1852. There the opposition of the Church to secret societies, and to the system of public schools, was enunciated. The third plenary council assembled at Baltimore on November 9, 1884, and continued in session about one month. The progress of the Church is shown in the fact that there were in attendance, belonging to the United States, fourteen archbishops, sixty bishops, and one prefect apostolic. The president was Archbishop Gibbons. The pastoral letter of the council dwelt on the importance of education for the clergy in the non-theological as well as the technical branches of knowledge; on the need, for the preservation of civil and religious liberty, of a religious training of the people, in connection with a secular schooling; and on family duties, including the benefit of household devotions. It is understood that the council proposed that rectors should be irremovable except for cause, and should elect the bishops; that a catechism should be made for the whole country; and that a Catholic university should be established. Should the first of these proposed changes be carried out, the Roman Catholic Church would no longer stand in the dependent relation of a missionary church.

A sketch of religious phenomena in the United States can hardly omit a notice of the Mormons. As in the case of Mohammedanism, it may be a question whether Mormonism has in it enough of Christianity to entitle it to the name of a heresy, or whether it is not properly classified with false or heathen religions. The Mormon sect was founded at Manchester, New York, in 1830, by Joseph Smith. He professed to have been guided by an angel to a spot where he found buried the "Book of Mormon," written on thin gold plates. How far a manuscript, written for quite another purpose by one Solomon Spalding, furnished the material for this Mormon Bible, is an unsettled question. In style, it is an imitation of the Authorized Version of the Scriptures. It was alleged to be the production of Mormon, a Hebrew, the survivor of emigrants from Palestine to Chili, who came thither centuries before the Christian era. Smith established the sect of

The Mor-
mons.

Mormons, or "Latter Day Saints," as he styled them, on the basis of this imposture. In 1843, he professed to have a revelation sanctioning polygamy. Driven from Illinois in 1848, the Mormons removed to the Territory of Utah, and founded Salt Lake City. Brigham Young had taken the place of Smith as a leader, who had been killed by a mob. Young died in 1877, and was succeeded by John Taylor, an Englishman. He has lately died. The Mormon recruits have been obtained by emissaries sent to Europe, largely from the working-class in Great Britain, in Sweden, and in Norway. A body of anti-polygamist seceders from the Mormon community has been formed, and still another Mormon sect, opposed to polygamy, originated in 1851.

CHAPTER VII.

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.

THE Missions which the Catholic Church, with so much zeal and energy, had planted in all parts of the world during the first age of the Reformation, began to languish as the eighteenth century drew to a close. The controversy on the Chinese and Malabar customs, which has already been spoken of, the suppression of the Jesuit order in 1773, and the political revolution which convulsed France and Europe, and curtailed for a time the power of the Roman see, were the principal causes of this decline. Hardly had

Roman Catholic missions in the nineteenth century.

the present century begun, however, when the Church entered upon a new era of missionary conquest. Pius

VII. regained the lost prerogatives, restored the Jesuits, and reopened the College of the Propaganda, the foremost of all the Catholic institutions for the education of missionaries. The prosperity of the college continued to increase, and in 1867 there were represented among its students so many nations, that on the first Sunday after Epiphany the blessings of the advent were chanted in twenty-five different languages. The missions of the Catholic Church have been in this century, as before, under the direction of

Their organization.

the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, at Rome, or the Propaganda, as it is usually called, which was founded in 1622. By its authority a simple mission with chapel, orphanage, and, perhaps, hospital, might be raised to an apostolic prefecture, or a vicariate, or, last of all, to an episcopate

of a higher or lower grade. In this way the hierarchical organization of the Church of Rome has been extended well-nigh over the whole world. The movements of its missionaries have been all the more effective from having been guided by a single committee composed of the cardinals of the Propaganda. Under such a system there could not be that interference with each other which has so often hindered the efforts of Protestant missionary societies. The most notable of the organizations which have contributed to the support of the missions is the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, which was founded at Lyons in 1822.

Not only the training colleges but also the religious orders, and especially the Jesuits, the Franciscans, the Dominicans, the Lazarists, the Picpus Society, the Capuchins, and the Carmelites, have sent forth missionaries to bear the message of the Church to all the nations of the earth. In the Turk-

The missionaries and their work.

ish Empire and Persia, as well as in Egypt and Abyssinia, they have continually endeavored, and not without a measure of success, to bring the sects, the Armenians, the Copts, etc., into allegiance to the See of Rome. The work in India, weakened as it was in the last century by the controversy about the Malabar customs and by the suppression of the Jesuits, was still further disturbed, after the year 1834, by a schism at Goa. But such misfortunes did not prevent the steady growth of the Church. In Eastern Asia, in Annam, Cochin China, China, and Japan, the missionaries were persecuted again and again, until religious liberty was proclaimed in these lands through the influence of the European powers. Nor was the climate of Africa less destructive than the swords of the Orientals. But the missionaries, who knew no allegiance but that to Christ and the Holy Mother Church, were not to be turned back by danger. Many of them even coveted the martyr's crown. Across the ocean, in British America and the United States, the Church has steadily grown in numbers and in authority, while in Mexico and in several of the South American republics it has been deprived of much of its wealth and many of its ancient privileges. The Catholic missionaries, though they have labored assiduously in these older countries, have not been forgetful of the South Sea Islanders. Their work among these peoples has centred in the Wallis and Gambier islands, where they have established flourishing missions. But the present century has been signalized not so much by the successes of the Roman Church in the various lands of the world as by the rise of Protestant missions.

The Protestant Churches, as we have already seen, were not at

the outset moved by a desire to carry the gospel to the nations which then lay beyond the confines of Christendom. Many years passed before the missionary spirit, now so characteristic of all evangelical communities, began to make itself felt. In 1644, the General Court of Massachusetts ordered that the county courts should see to it that the Indians residing within their respective

Rise of Protestant missions.

shires should be "instructed in the knowledge and worship of God." To further these and similar efforts, the

Long Parliament, five years later, created a corporation, called the "President and Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England." This, the first Protestant missionary society,

Eliot, 1604-1690.

contributed to the support of John Eliot and others, who labored among the Indians dwelling in the neighborhood

of the Puritan colonies. The work thus begun was carried forward in the following century by such men as David Brainerd (1718-1747)

and Jonathan Edwards. The East Indies, where the hardy Netherlanders had wrested many colonies from the rule of the Portuguese, was the theatre of Dutch missionary activity in the early part of the seventeenth century. Thousands were here influenced by considerations of worldly advantage to accept Christianity, only to re-

lapse into heathenism when these motives were withdrawn. Such isolated endeavors as the Dutch and English put forth at this time could accomplish but little. The religious life of Protestant Chris-

tendom must first be quickened: instead of a dead orthodoxy there must be a living Christianity. The work of Spener (1635-1705) and Francke (1663-1727), the German pietists, was influential in

bringing about so needful a change. It was Dr. Lüt-

The Danish-Halle Mission.

ken, a court-preacher of Denmark, and a friend of Spener and Francke, who, in 1704, supported by King Frederick IV., com-

menced the first mission in the spirit of this revived Christianity. The men whom he sent out to Tranquebar, on the Southeastern coast

of India, had been trained in the atmosphere of German pietism. The mission itself owed more to the efforts of Francke, the founder

of the orphan-house at Halle, than even to the Danish king and his chaplain. It was thus appropriately styled the Danish-Halle

Mission. The accounts which Ziegenbalg sent to Francke of the success of the work at Tranquebar raised up many friends for the

enterprise. Money and books were contributed by English societies, and from King George I. came a letter expressing his grati-

fication, not only at the progress of the mission, "but also," said he, "because that, in this our kingdom, such a laudable zeal for the

promotion of the gospel prevails."

From the pietist movement the Moravian Church received, in part at least, its first missionary impulse. Count Zinzendorf, on whose estates the persecuted brethren from Moravia settled in 1722, was no less devout than themselves. His early intercourse with Francke had confirmed his already strong inclination to earnest communion with Christ. In one of his sermons, after he was ordained bishop of the Moravian Church (1737), he exclaimed, "I have one passion, and it is He, He alone." Incited by the story of the sufferings of the negroes at St. Thomas, in the West Indies, and of the patient, though unsuccessful efforts of Hans Egéde, a Norwegian pastor, in Greenland, Zinzendorf and the brethren determined, in 1732, to send two of their number to each country. Before a quarter of a century had passed, eighteen missionaries had gone forth, almost without purse or wallet, from Herrnhut to plant stations in various lands, and to gather a Christian community abroad which should far outnumber that at home.

The Evangelical revival in England, together with the new sympathy for humanity which manifested itself in the social and political movements of the later years of the eighteenth century, ushered in a brilliant era of missionary activity, an era which, in the history of missions, is only less remarkable than the first of the Christian ages. In 1784, a memorial was drawn up by an association of Baptist ministers at Nottingham, in England, urging the people to more earnest prayers for the outpouring of God's Spirit on both churches and pastors, and adding: "the spread of the gospel to the most distant parts of the habitable globe" should "be the object of your fervent requests." These thoughts, through the efforts of William Carey, a minister at Moulton, were turned into action. Carey was born in 1761, and was the son of a Northamptonshire schoolmaster and parish clerk. In his youth he loved to study plants, and to observe the habits of insects, birds, and animals. Nor did he neglect the languages. Notwithstanding many hinderances from the circumstances in which he was placed, he learned Latin, Greek, French, Dutch, and Hebrew. As early as 1781, three years before the meeting at Nottingham, he began to be absorbed in one thought, the sending of the gospel to the heathen. On the walls of the shop where he worked at his trade as a shoemaker, hung a map of the world, on which were arranged the latest religious and political statistics of each country. As soon as he became pastor at Moulton, he urged his views upon the neighboring ministers, but they refused to believe that such a project was not beset by

Moravian
missions.

The era of
missionary
activity.

Carey,
1761-1831.

insuperable obstacles. As the association which met at Nottingham in May, 1792, was about to disperse, he seized Andrew Fuller by the arm, and, in a beseeching tone, asked, "And are you, after all, going again to do nothing?" These words were not without their effect. On October 2d the Baptist society was founded, with Carey as one of its first missionaries. Carey sailed for India, and there, with the help of other members of the same society, founded the mission of Serampore.

The Baptist
Missionary
Society, 1792.

The letters which Carey sent to his friends in England aroused the interest of benevolent men, both clergy and laity, not only among the dissenters, but also in the Established Church.

The London
Missionary So-
ciety, 1795.

Out of this feeling sprang the London Missionary Society, which was to be a union of Independents, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Episcopalians, whose "only strife," it was said, "shall be, not to promote the interests of a special section, since Christ is not divided, but with united earnestness to make known afar the glory of his person, the perfection of his work, the wonders of his grace, and the overflowing blessings of his redemption." The directors of the society, interested, as Carey had been, in "Cook's Voyages," chose the South Sea Islands as the field of its first operations. Meanwhile the religious movements of the age had aroused the Church of England to new life. In 1799, sixteen of the clergy, encouraged by Wilberforce, the great anti-slavery advocate, and other like-minded men, founded the organization

The Church
Missionary So-
ciety, 1799;
1812.

which in 1812 became the Church Missionary Society for Africa and the East. One of its principles was that "the friendly relation to other missionary societies shall be maintained." Thenceforward the London Society passed gradually under the control of the Independents. At about the same time

the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, an outgrowth of the old Puritan corporation, came into the hands of the High Church party. Since then, complaint has been made that "it considers itself justified, as the representative of 'the Church,' to 'build everywhere on other men's foundations.'" The Methodists were not behind their brethren

Coke,
1747-1814.

in missionary zeal. In 1786, Coke, having sailed for Nova Scotia, was driven south by a storm and landed in the West Indies, where he forthwith began to preach to the negro slaves. The work which he commenced there and in Ceylon was taken up by the Wesleyan Missionary Society, which was formed soon after his death.

The efforts of the English and Irish Presbyterians were naturally overshadowed by those of their more numerous brethren in Scotland. The Scottish and Glasgow Missionary Societies, Scottish missionary societies. founded in 1796, ceased before the middle of the present century to have an existence separate from the organizations of the Churches of Scotland. The opposition to missions which had hitherto existed in the Established Church, was overcome by the earnest words of Chalmers, as well as by his strong Duff, 1806-1873. personal influence. The result was that in 1829 Alexander Duff, one of the most remarkable missionary leaders of modern times, was sent out to India. When the ecclesiastical Disruption of 1843 came, Duff entered the Free Church movement, and was foremost in building up its eminently successful mission work. From the year 1847, the United Presbyterian Church of Scotland has energetically supported many missionary enterprises, chiefly in the West Indies. In cooperation with these British associations have been the Religious Tract Society, founded Auxiliary societies. in 1799, which circulates books and pamphlets in one hundred and sixty-six languages, and the British and Foreign Bible Society, established in 1804, which publishes and distributes the Scriptures, or parts of them, in at least one hundred and ninety-six languages or dialects. In addition to these, a similar work has been done by other smaller organizations. There is also a Medical Missionary Society in Edinburgh. Trained in its institution, physicians go forth to the various heathen nations to preach the gospel, not only by words but by merciful deeds of healing. Connected with many of the larger societies are women's associations, whose purpose it is to enlighten and save the ignorant and suffering women of pagan lands.

While the missionary activity was growing up in Great Britain, the Christians of America were becoming animated with a like zeal. In 1808, through the efforts of Samuel Mills, a American missionary societies. society was formed at Williams College, called "The Brethren," with the object "to effect, in the persons of its members, a mission or missions to the heathen." Not long after, the society was transferred to the newly founded Andover Theological Seminary, where its members were increased by young men from other colleges. One of the ablest of these, Adoniram Judson, drew up a memorial to the General Association of Massachusetts, which met in 1810 at Bradford, asking whether they would receive the support of the churches in their purpose to become missionaries. To the memorial were affixed the names of Judson, Nott, Mills, and

Newell. This appeal led to the founding of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Early in the year 1812 the first missionaries sailed for Calcutta. Through the intolerance of the East India Company's Government, they were forced to take refuge, two in Bombay, one in Burmah, and another in Ceylon. About this time an event of a different kind, which was equally disheartening to the friends of the enterprise, was the change in the views of Judson and Rice on the question of baptism, and their consequent separation from the Board. In the end, however, this proved to be not a misfortune but a blessing; for by it the American Baptist churches were aroused to form a union for the promotion of the cause of missions. Burmah, whither Judson found his way in July, 1813, has been the field of their most successful labors. The American Board, though originating with the Congregationalists, enjoyed for many years the cooperation of the Presbyterian and of the Dutch Reformed Churches. But in 1837, the old-school Presbyterians founded an independent board of their own, in the support of which the new school joined after the reunion of the two branches of the Church in 1870. The Dutch Reformed, likewise, in 1857, severed their connection with the American Board, and carried on their work alone. The work of the American Board in India, the Sandwich Islands, and among the degenerate churches of Western Asia, is especially noteworthy. Connected with it is an independent and prosperous Woman's Board, having the same purpose as the organizations of a similar nature already mentioned. The Presbyterians and the Baptists in like manner have women's missionary societies. It is impossible to do more than allude to the organizations of the Methodists, the Episcopalians, and the Lutherans, as well as of the many other denominations which exist in America.

The evangelical communities on the Continent—in the Netherlands, in Germany, and in France—though they are far behind their English-speaking brethren in the extent of their labors—are imbued with the missionary spirit. The society which has its headquarters at Basel, and in consequence bears the name of that city, although it is in reality a German organization, is remarkable for its harmonious combination of both Lutheran and Reformed Churches. No less so, and for the same reason, is the Rhenish Missionary Society.

Having given this brief, and therefore necessarily imperfect, sketch of the organizations which carry on the work of sending the

The A. B. C. F. M.

The American Baptist Missionary Union, 1814.

The Presbyterian Board, 1837; 1870.

The societies on the Continent.

gospel to the heathen, it remains to state what has been accomplished in the different lands. The obstacles which the missionaries were obliged to overcome in laying the foundations of their work were in many places of such a nature that years passed before the missions were securely established and their various agencies set in operation. Strange languages and dialects, which in their structure and forms bore little resemblance to the European tongues, and some of which had not even been reduced to writing, were to be mastered. It was necessary to make grammars and dictionaries, as well as translations of the Scriptures. The peoples to whom the missionaries sought to teach the principles of Christianity and Christian civilization were either under the dominion of religions of their own, religions which, though corrupted by superstition and idolatry, inculcated much that was commendable, or else were sunk in the lowest stages of savagery, with little susceptibility to moral and religious impressions. Nor were these the only difficulties which beset the path of the missionaries. Their work was hindered by the bitter jealousy of profligate European adventurers, or by the suspicion and fears of great trading companies, which saw an end of their despotism in the coming of Christian enlightenment. But from the time when Bartholomew Ziegenbalg lay in the Danish prison at Tranquebar, or, seated on the sands with the native children, learned the Tamil language, men went forth in the spirit of the apostles, endured hardship as became good soldiers of the cross, and labored patiently in the face of many discouragements, until hardly a barrier remained in the way of the diffusion of the gospel and of the Scriptures in every land, among nations speaking more than three hundred languages.

In India, which was the theatre of some of the earliest missionary efforts, the people spoke twenty-five languages and adhered to four great religious systems—Hinduism, which is Brahmanism, as somewhat modified by the teaching of Buddha, Parseeism, Mohammedanism, and the so-called Devil worship. In 1706, Ziegenbalg and Plütschau began the Danish-Halle Mission at Tranquebar on the Coromandel coast. These men and their successors gave the Scriptures to the people in the vernacular, founded schools, and gathered many converts. From Tranquebar they went forth into the neighboring region. They labored in Madras. In 1758, one of them, Kiernander, established a mission in Calcutta. Schwartz, who arrived on the field in 1750, and who was the ablest of those sent out by the Danish-Halle Society,

The obstacles
to missionary
effort.

Mission work
in India.

Schwartz,
1726-1798.

had so wide a reputation for probity that the famous Hyder Ali, with whom the Madras Government was negotiating, said, "Send me the Christian, he will not deceive me." In 1793, William Carey, a man who did still more for the evangelization of India, landed at Calcutta. After securing a position as superintendent of an indigo factory, and thus rescuing himself and his family from want, thrown as they were in a strange land upon their own resources, he devoted his splendid linguistic abilities to the translation of the Scriptures into Bengali and the other languages of India. Not long after, he was appointed to a professorship of Bengali, later of Sanskrit and Mahrattî, in the new government college founded at Calcutta by the Marquis of Wellesley. From this time he devoted a large part of his ample revenues to the support of the Serampore Mission. He and his associates, Marshman and Ward, "had all things common," and the brotherhood of which they were the leading members contributed £80,000 to the mission, in various ways, before the half-century closed. Carey died in 1834, having done a pioneer work in the study of Oriental languages, invaluable not only to the cause of missions but to the science of philology.

Meanwhile the London and Church Missionary Societies, together with the Propagation Society, had sent their representatives to India. In 1823, Reginald Heber succeeded Middleton, as Bishop of Calcutta. In 1830, Alexander Duff, who was sent out by the Church of Scotland, established a school in Calcutta in which instruction was conveyed, not through the medium of the vernacular but of the English language. The remarkable success which attended this enterprise gradually overcame the opposition with which it was at first greeted. The missionaries of many societies pressed eagerly into the field. Stations were formed in the Orissa district, the seat of the degrading worship of Juggernaut, and in the most distant regions of Bengal. Even the people of Benares, "the Athens of India and the chief stronghold of Hinduism," began to long for a purer and better religion than that which flourished in their thousand temples. Still farther North went the persevering Moravians, and labored in the valleys of the Himalayas. During the early years of Indian missions, the East India Company's jealousy thwarted the efforts of the missionaries. It was this intolerance which drove Hall and Nott, of the American Board, to Bombay, Newell to Ceylon, and Judson to Burmah, and thus was the occasion of founding three prosperous missions. From Bombay the repre-

representatives of the Board established their mission at Ahmednuggur, which gathered many converts through direct evangelistic work and the labors of native Bible women. The mission which shared Ceylon with the Wesleyans, Baptists, and English Church societies, sought, in 1834, to divert a part of its energies to labor on the mainland. Thus arose the Madura Mission. What Alexander Duff did for Calcutta was done for Bombay by another Scotchman, John Wilson, who became a distinguished Orientalist. The work of all these and of the many other societies was restricted, for the most part, to the men of India. To carry the gospel and Christian education to the women has been the purpose of many devoted Christians of their own sex, and since 1854 it has been done in an organized form known as the Zenana Mission. As a result of the efforts which have been expended in India and Ceylon, there were, in 1883, over six hundred thousand native Christians, about one-fourth of whom were communicants.

In Burmah, Judson labored six years before there was a single convert. Although from the end of that time churches gradually grew up, the most remarkable success was attained among the Karens who dwelt in the interior. The missionaries, undismayed by the assertion that this people "were as untamable as the wild cow of the mountains," entered their country. The natives who ventured out from their hiding-places in the jungle, relieved to know that the new-comers were not government officials but teachers of religion, said, "Our fathers say the Karens once had God's book, written on leather, and they carelessly allowed it to be destroyed: since then, as a punishment we have been without books and without a written language." The missionaries listened to their appeal, translated the Bible into their language, and gathered many thousands of them into the Burman Church.

China, which proudly cherished the maxims of Confucius and worshipped according to the degenerate rites of Taoism and Buddhism, did not admit the messengers of the gospel within her borders until she was forced to throw open her gates to the sellers of opium. During the long interval between 1807—the time when Robert Morrison, sent out by the London Missionary Society, began to live in disguise at Canton—and 1842, when Europeans were allowed to reside in the five "treaty ports," the Bible, together with other Christian writings, was translated and circulated in Chinese. The American Board was the second society to begin work in China. Afterwards not less

Wilson,
1804-1875.

Burmah;
Judson,
1788-1850.

China.

than twenty-eight entered the country. As the years went on, the provinces along the coast were occupied, together with a few of those in the interior. It has been one of the principal aims to influence the intellectual classes by means of a pure Christian literature. Not until 1865 was an attempt made to reach the central provinces. In that year, the Chinese Inland Mission was founded, and began its work, which at first was necessarily one of preparation. Among the millions of China, there were in 1883 only about seventy thousand Christians, not less than twenty thousand being communicants; and yet much had already been done to dispel the darkness of idolatry and superstition.

The Japanese, while to some extent adhering to their ancient Shintoism, like so many Oriental peoples, became followers of Buddha. From the year 1854, the date of the Perry expedition, they have eagerly sought after the material

Japan.

civilization, science, and thought of the West. The Presbyterians of America were the first among the Protestants to carry to them the religion of the Western nations. In 1877, they joined with the Scotch United Presbyterian and the American Reformed Churches, in "the Union Church of Christ." The year previous, the government showed its inclination towards Christian institutions by making Sunday an official holiday.

From Japan, with its thirteen thousand Christians, about five thousand of whom, in 1883, were communicants, and from its promising future, we turn to Western Asia and to the reformation among the degenerate remnants of the ancient churches. In 1821, Levi Parsons, of the American Board, after travelling over the region once occupied by the Seven Churches, became the

The Syrian Mission.

first Protestant missionary resident at Jerusalem. The anarchy which prevailed in that part of Palestine made it impossible to remain, and the Syrian Mission dates its beginning from the arrival of William Goodell and Isaac Bird at Beyrout, in 1823. Their labors were opposed by the Maronites, whose patriarch resided at Kanobin, and who, though they were a branch of the ancient Monothelite sect, had, during the middle ages, united themselves to the Roman See. Four years later, representatives of the Episcopal, Lutheran, Latin, Greek, Maronite, Armenian, and Abyssinian Churches, met and celebrated the communion. Thus began the Syrian Evangelical Church. The translation of the

Smith,
1801-1857.

Bible into Arabic, begun by Dr. Eli Smith, and after his death completed by Dr. Van Dyck, was published in 1865. Six years later, the corner-stone of the Syrian Protestant

College was laid at Beyrout. Meanwhile the mission had been surrendered into the hands of the Presbyterian Board, strengthened as it was, in 1870, by the accession of the new-school Presbyterians. Stations at Jerusalem, Nazareth, and other historic towns were founded by the Church Missionary Society. In addition to these, other missions, both medical and educational, were established.

The beginnings of a new life in the Armenian Church came from the publication, by the British and Foreign Bible Society, with the aid of a society in Russia, of the Scriptures, both in ancient and modern Armenian. Several educated men earnestly studied the Bible and embraced the evangelical faith. In 1831, Dr. Goodell was sent to Constantinople to open a mission. For a time it seemed likely that there would be a reformation within that Church. But the Armenian ecclesiastics, like their Greek brethren, became more and more jealous of the movement for reform. Finally, in 1846, they launched their ecclesiastical anathemas against those who should continue to hold the new views. This led to the formation in that year of the First Evangelical Armenian Church. Other churches were immediately organized in the various cities to which the work of the missionaries had been extended from Constantinople. The field was divided in 1860 into three great departments, the Eastern, Central, and Western Turkey Missions, in each of which there later grew up a thriving college. The unsatisfactory character of former versions made it necessary to procure a translation of the Scriptures into Armeno-Turkish. Few names deserve so high a place in the history of this branch of missionary effort as that of Dr. Goodell, whose work was completed in 1861. Beside him stands

Schauffler,
1798-1883.

Dr. Schauffler, who translated the New Testament into Turkish, using the Arabic or sacred character. Drawn by all these and similiar influences, the Christian community of the Turkish Empire steadily grew until, in 1883, it numbered wellnigh one hundred thousand. The American Board began an equally interesting work among the Nestorians in Western Persia,

*Persia ;
Martyn,
1781-1812.*

which in 1871 it turned over to the Presbyterians. The first to enter the Eastern districts of Persia were the Moravians. After suffering great hardships, they were obliged to withdraw. In 1811, Henry Martyn, English government chaplain at Cawnpore, entered the dominions of the Shah, that he might perfect the translation of the New Testament into Persian. His already shattered health was still further undermined, and a year

later, his version then being completed, he died, while on his way to Constantinople. In this part of the field, the Church Missionary Society is carrying on the work begun by these early pioneers.

In Africa there still exist remnants of the early Christian churches. These are the Monophysite Copts, and the Abyssinians, who cherish a similar faith. To reach these sects, the

Egypt.

Moravian Brethren started for Egypt in the last century, but their efforts, as well as the first attempts of the English Church missionaries, did little but prepare the way for the more successful labors of the United Presbyterians of America, who entered the field in 1854. Thirty years of preaching and teaching raised up a Christian community from among the Copts, numbering eight thousand, of whom a little over eleven hundred were communicants. The sending of the gospel to the other regions of Africa, where dwelt hundreds of different tribes, degraded by superstition, speaking strange and barbarous tongues, and frequently engaged in bloody conflicts with one another, is a record of much suffering. In 1768, nine Moravians landed on the unhealthy Western coast, but in less than two years had fallen victims to disease. They

The Western coast.

were the first of those who have willingly sacrificed their lives to plant missions from Senegambia to Cape Colony. The sixteen societies which have entered this region have brought about one hundred thousand natives into the Christian community.

A still more effective work has been done in South Africa, beginning with the planting of a mission among the Kafirs by Vanderkemp, of the London Missionary Society, in the last

South Africa.
Moffat,
1795-1883.

years of the eighteenth century. The well-known Robert Moffat, once a Scotch gardener, was among the first to press beyond the Orange River to the wild tribes dwelling in Bechuanaland. Under the influence of such men as he, savage chieftains were transformed into friends of justice and peace. His associate and son-in-law was the celebrated David Livingstone, who, together with others, did much to throw open the interior

Livingstone,
1813-1873.

of Africa to the influences of Christian civilization. Livingstone in 1849 started for Lake Ngami, and thus began those memorable expeditions into the unexplored regions of Africa which only ended with his life on the shores of Lake Bangweolo, on May 1, 1873. The first result of this work was the attempt to found a "Universities Mission" (representing Oxford, Durham, and Dublin) at the south of Lake Nyassa, near the Shiré River, in 1861. More prosperous were those established at Livingstonia and Blan-

tyre, the one on Lake Nyassa, the other not far from the site of the unfortunate "Universities Mission," and commemorating the name and birthplace of the explorer whose endurance of untold privations and dangers made them possible. Stations were soon after erected on the shores of the greater lakes to the north, along the banks of the Congo, and at Bihé, one of the principal caravan-centres of Africa.

When, in 1818, the missionaries of the London Society entered Madagascar, the natives had long forsaken the simple faith of their ancestors, which tradition says once flourished in the land, and had become idolaters. The king, Radama I., though himself a pagan, favored the introduction of a Christian education among his people. At his death, in 1828, one of his wives seized the throne, after putting to death all those who stood in her way. Although ardently devoted to the idols of her nation, she did not prevent the forming of two Christian churches in 1831. But only a few years passed before the pagan party persuaded her that the devotees of the new religion were plotting treason. She then began a persecution which in ferocity has scarcely ever been excelled, and which only ended with her death in 1861. Here, as in many other places and ages, the blood of the martyrs was the seed of the Church. The region about the capital, with its quarter of a million of native Christians, was in 1883 the centre from which the rest of the island must soon be evangelized.

On the western hemisphere Protestant missions have been planted from Greenland to Patagonia. The Eskimos received the gospel from the Moravians, the Indians of British America from the Church missionaries and the Wesleyans.

The native tribes which dwell within the borders of the United States, as well as the negroes and the Chinese immigrants, have been to some extent cared for by various organizations of the American Churches. In the West Indies, the missions, which the Moravians were the first among the Protestants to establish, were pushed forward with great success by the Baptists and Methodists. Notwithstanding the ravages of disease in Central America and Guiana and the ferocity of the natives in Patagonia and the islands on its shores, missions were founded in these lands and have built up small Christian communities.

The missions of the South Sea Islands form one of the most interesting pages in the story of the triumphs of Christianity. There, in less than a half-century, thousands of degraded cannibals were transformed into intelligent, peace-loving

Central
Africa.

Madagascar.

North and
South Amer-
ica.

The South
Sea Islands.

men and women. To reach them the missionaries shrank neither from toil nor from danger. The London Society in 1796 despatched

their first mission to Tahiti, an island of great natural
Tahiti. beauty, but inhabited by a race given over to superstition, sensuality, and cannibalism. The missionaries were well received by Pomare, the king, whose son, Pomare II., also favored the introduction of the new religion. But it was not until 1815, when Pomare became victorious over his rebellious chiefs, that Christianity gained the ascendancy. Two years later, the principal men of the island gathered to see the early sheets of the Tahitian spelling-book, catechism, and Gospel of Luke, struck off on

the press recently brought by William Ellis. The natives, when they saw the first printed page, "raised a general shout of astonishment and joy." Soon after, "aged chiefs, and priests and warriors, with their spelling-books in their hands, might be seen sitting on the benches in the schools, side by side, perhaps, with some little boy or girl by whom they were now being taught the use of letters." Already the island and the islands about it had been, at least outwardly, Christianized, when the Jesuits landed under the guns of a French cruiser and broke up the church. But the converts remained faithful, and in 1863 were organized anew by the Paris (Protestant) Missionary Society.

A still more remarkable work was done in the Sandwich Islands, which early in this century were united under the sway of Kamehameha I. Liholiho (Kamehameha II.), who succeeded him in 1819, allowed the tyrannical ordinances of the Hawaiian religion to be set at naught, and when the idolatrous chiefs rose in rebellion, he not only crushed the revolt but destroyed the national idols and temples. Meanwhile several Sandwich Islanders had found their way to the United States. Among them was a youth named Obookiah, who, having landed at New Haven, Conn., and being attracted by the buildings of Yale College, asked what was the use to which they were put. Some time afterwards he was discovered on the steps of one of these buildings, weeping because there was no one to give him instruction. The interest which this incident excited led to the establishment of the

Hawaiian Mission by the American Board. When, in
Work of the A. B. C. F. M. 1820, the missionaries landed on the Sandwich Islands, they were astonished to find that the country had been swept by a war in which the ancient religion, with its idols, temples, and priesthood had perished. The people listened gladly to the teaching of the missionaries. Year after year the church in

creased in numbers and power. In 1837, a wave of religious feeling swept over the land, and more than twenty thousand were converted. The mission met with such wonderful success that in 1848 the Board began to organize independent native churches, preparatory to withdrawing from the field. Fifteen years later, the mission was placed under the control of the Hawaiian Evangelical Association. In the meantime, the Hawaiians had undertaken, with the advice and assistance of the American Board, a mission to the Micronesian Islands, and an independent mission of their own to the islands of Marquesas.

Taught and guided by the Wesleyans, thousands of the Fiji Islanders, the fiercest cannibals of the South Seas, were subdued under the power of the gospel, and became eager to carry it to pagan tribes beyond their shores. The history of the efforts to Christianize the New Hebrides is associated with the names of many noble men, but especially with that of John Coleridge Patteson. He was the son of Justice Patteson of the Queen's Bench, and Frances Coleridge, niece of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. It was while he was away at Eton that Selwyn, who had been recently appointed Bishop of New Zealand, said to his mother: "Lady Patteson, will you give me Coley?" The desire to go with the bishop which then sprang up in Patteson's mind did not pass away as the years went on and he became a fellow of Merton College, Oxford, and curate of Alfington. When Selwyn was again at his house, in 1854, he could no longer smother this cherished wish. With unselfish love his family gave him to the work of preaching the gospel to the Melanesians. He labored under Selwyn's direction until 1861, when he was consecrated Bishop of Melanesia. Almost his first duty was the sad one of burying Gordon and his wife, missionaries from the Presbyterian Church in Canada, who had been murdered by the natives of Erromanga. In 1867, the headquarters of the mission were moved from New Zealand to Norfolk Island, which was nearer the scene of Patteson's labors, as well as better suited to the physical constitution of the children whom he brought from the tropical islands on the north to be educated. Four years more of devoted work, and then he lay dead, slain by the savage inhabitants of Nukapu. With such labors and sacrifices as these has Christianity been carried to the islands of the Pacific.

It is impossible to estimate the results of modern missionary activity by merely counting the number of converts, or even the number of those who belong to the Christian community. While

The Fiji Islands; the New Hebrides; Patteson, 1827-1871.

it has been the principal aim of the missionaries to substitute the law of Christ for the reign of superstition, it is to be remembered that in bringing about this change they have frequently given a civilization to savages and a literature to nations that had no alphabet. Nor should we be unmindful of how much, in other ways, they have contributed to the advancement of human knowledge. To them almost every science, and especially geography, ethnology, sociology, and philology, owes some of its richest materials. In fine, even the humblest missionary has shared in a work which, in the nobility of its object and the beneficence of its results, is one of the principal achievements of modern times.

The results of modern missionary activity.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

IN the latter half of the seventeenth century there arose in the Church of England a class of divines who were called by their opponents "Latitudinarians." They were generally connected with the University of Cambridge. The appeal which they made to reason in theology laid them open to the imputation of laxness of doctrine. They were genial students of the ancient classical authors. They set a high value upon the teaching of Plato. While attached to Episcopacy, they did not consider that polity among the criteria of a true church. In theology they were in sympathy with the Greek fathers and with the Arminians. They devoted themselves to the attempt to build up a rational system, which might win the adhesion of skeptics and inquirers and promote peace among Christian believers. With Dissenters they cultivated friendly relations, and did their best to soften the asperities engendered in the Puritan controversy and the civil war. As regards the Church of England they manifested the same irenical spirit. They favored a comprehension broad enough to satisfy the scruples of the Puritans, which had so long existed respecting certain points of doctrine and rite. They were stimulated in such endeavors by the mischievous effect of the writings of Hobbes, and the evils threatened by the progress of infidelity. The founder of this school was Dr. Whichcot, whose character is depicted by Burnet in a very attractive light. The most eminent writer of their number was Cudworth, who in his "Treatise on Immutable

Ralph Cudworth,
1617-1688.

Morality," and in his "Intellectual System of the Universe," advocated with profound ability an intuitive theory of morals, presented a noble exposition of the Platonic system, and confuted the different schemes of Pantheism and Atheism. Henry More, the author of the "Antidote to Atheism," and other writings, a disciple of Plato; John Norris, who wrote the "Theory of the Ideal and Intelligible World," besides numerous other works; Theophilus Gale, author of "The Court of the Gentiles;" John Smith, whose Discourses are "a delightful mixture of philosophy and poetry," were connected with this school, in which philosophical reasoning was often connected with an interesting vein of mysticism. A distinguished preacher and commentator of the same class was Bishop Patrick, whose exposition of the Old Testament is the best-known of his works. The most renowned of the preachers of the Cambridge school was Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury. His

John Tillotson,
1630-1694.

clearness of intellect, sweetness of temper, and prudence in his high station are warmly commended by all his contemporaries. He was the chief representative of a new style of preaching, in which pedantry and scholasticism of every sort were abjured, and teaching from the pulpit was clothed in plain, correct, and effective English. If the new type of preaching fell below that of the old Puritan divines in the power to rouse the conscience and affect the soul with an awe-inspiring sense of the realities of the supernatural world, it presented the ethical aspects of the gospel in a way to interest the generality of hearers. In London, which had been the stronghold of Puritanism, large accessions were gained by the new preachers to the Established Church. Bishop Burnet, himself of the Latitudinarian school, says of Tillotson: "I never knew any clergyman so universally esteemed and beloved as he was for above twenty years." His style received the highest praise from Dryden and from Addison.

The great and acknowledged merits of Tillotson did not shield him from suspicion and attack. He believed in the influence of the Divine Spirit in the soul, yet stood aloof from what
Theology of Tillotson. ever might seem mystical. The design of Christ's death, he said, was to create in us a deep feeling of the guilt of sin. Christ died in our stead; yet the same truth is expressed when it is said that he died for our benefit. In a sermon preached before Queen Mary, on the eternity of future punishment, he hinted at the possibility of restoration, while denying any authorized hope of such a result. His language is: "He that threatens keeps the right of punishing in his own hand, and is not obliged to execute

what he hath threatened any further than the reasons and ends of government do require." He adverts to the case of Nineveh and the "peevish prophet," Jonah. Such tendencies of thought and expressions in Tillotson led to his being charged with Socinianism.

In the earlier part of the century there had been precursors of the Latitudinarian school. Jeremy Taylor, who turned away from Calvinistic doctrine, might be counted among them. One of these forerunners was John Hales, Fellow at Eton, and previously Greek professor at Oxford, of whom one of his friends relates that on hearing a speech of Episcopius "he *bid John Calvin good-night*, as he often told." He did not, however, join the Arminians, but held himself aloof from parties. "Those things," he wrote, "which we reverence for antiquity, what were they at their first birth? Were they false? Time cannot make them true. Were they true? Time cannot make them more true." Another writer, who had
Chillingworth, 1602-1644. earlier applied reason to theology, in the tone characteristic of the Cambridge school, was William Chillingworth. In his youth he was made a convert to the Church of Rome; but impartial inquiry, to which he was recommended by Laud, his godfather, brought him back to Protestantism. He had objected to signing the Thirty-nine Articles, but he altered his mind and subscribed to them, declaring that nothing more was implied in the act than a pledge not "to disturb the peace or renounce the communion" of the Church of England. The custom thus began of loose subscription to the Articles, not as "articles of truth," but as "articles of peace." In his "Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation," a work which has always been deemed a masterpiece of logic, Chillingworth shows that authority must rest on a basis of reason. "If Scripture," he says, "cannot be the judge of any controversy, how shall that concerning the Church and the notes of it be determined? And if it be the sole judge of this one, why may it not be of others? Why not of all? Those only excepted wherein the Scripture itself is the subject of the question, which cannot be determined but by natural reason, the only principle, besides Scripture, which is common to Christians." Thus he showed that the argument for Rome was a piece of circular reasoning. If we cannot interpret Scripture, how can we interpret the passages which are said to confer this exalted prerogative on the Church? Chillingworth says: "I am fully assured that God does not, and, therefore, that men ought not, to require any more of any man than this—to believe the Scripture to be God's

word, to endeavor to find the true sense of it, and to live according to it."

The most important controversy among Christian believers in England was that relating to the Trinity. This doctrine had been

The Trinitarian controversy. maintained against the Socinians, and against historical views of Petavius, a Roman Catholic, and of Arminian writers, by Bishop Bull. His "Defence of the Nicene

George Bull, 1634-1710. Creed" was published in 1685. It was a work of great

learning, although he ascribes to the Ante-Nicene writers a more precise and formulated conception of the doctrine than scholars at present attribute to them. He wrote other works on the same theme. He was thanked by Bossuet, in the name of the Roman Catholic clergy of France, for his vindication of the orthodox doctrine. Expressions in a work on this subject by Bishop Sherlock, in 1690, led to his being accused of Tritheism by Dr. Wallis, and by the famous preacher, Robert South, who in their turn were charged with Sabellianism. Among the writers who mingled in this debate were Stillingfleet and the Puritan divines, Owen and John Howe. The Arian controversy properly began with the publication of Dr. Samuel Clarke's "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity." This was in 1712. Clarke was the leading English metaphysician of the time. His doctrine was high-Arian, approaching near to the orthodox view, but falling below it. The principal opponent of Clarke was Dr. Daniel Waterland; but numerous authors, on one side or the other, took part in the discussion. Whitby, Whiston, and Sykes favored the Arian cause. Arianism had many adherents among the clergy of the Establishment, and not a few in the dissenting bodies.

A high degree of interest belongs to the Deistic controversy. It was connected with the spirit of rationalism—as it may be

The Deistic controversy. termed, for the lack of a better name—which characterized the age. The principal occasion of the rise of De-

ism was the intense agitation and prolonged strife of parties on the subject of religion, which had existed in England for nearly two centuries. As the excitement of partisan conflict began to subside, many began to inquire if there was not a substance of doctrine which was held in common by all the contending parties; and it occurred to them that it might be found in the simple truths of natural religion. Everything beyond these was imagined to spring from delusion, either deliberate or undesigned. What was required, as it was thought, was to sweep away this overgrowth of superstitions. Thus the Deists acknowledged the being of God,

but denied revelation and miracle. This was their defining characteristic. It was not until Hume wrote his "Dialogues on Natural Religion" that skepticism went so far as to call in question the grounds of natural theology, and to broach, respecting the origin of religion in general, theories akin to those which are current among skeptics at the present day.

The toleration granted by English law did not include the protection from penalties of such as assailed the Christian revelation or its leading doctrines. Hence the Deistical writers made no direct assault. They availed themselves of insinuation and irony, and sought to undermine the edifice which it was neither safe nor decorous openly to attack. The evidences commonly relied upon by believers in Christianity they endeavored to show to be weak and insufficient.

The father of English Deism was Lord Herbert of Cherbury. He was for a time an ambassador to France, and he served with the Prince of Orange as a soldier in Holland. He was

Herbert,
1581-1633.

a man of pure character, and was accustomed to pray. His philosophical and religious opinions are set forth in two works, the "De Veritate," published in 1624, which is a philosophical treatise of uncommon originality, and in his book on the heathen religions—"De Religione Gentilium." He finds five truths at the foundation of all religions—the existence of a supreme God, the duty of worship, the obligations of virtue and piety as involved in this service owed to the Deity, the duty of repenting of sins and of forsaking them, the fact of rewards and punishments in this life and in the life to come. There is no polemic against Christianity, but it is not doubtful that the writer considers everything beyond the five tenets to be the invention of priests, or otherwise a form of superstition. The writer who, more than any other, provoked con-

Hobbes,
1588-1679.

troversy and gave rise to multiplied defences of religion, was Thomas Hobbes. With a strong intellectual grasp, and in a remarkably lucid style, he propounded in his principal work, "The Leviathan," doctrines which are subversive of the basis of morals. The work was a plea for absolutism in civil government, and for the unqualified obligation of obedience on the part of the subject. Assuming that the state of nature is a state of war, each man being bent on self-gratification, he not only infers the need of a common power for the sake of peace, but makes subjection to this power, even in religious professions and in all the externals of worship, the primary duty. He even recognizes no justice prior to the organization of society, which is based on expediency. Ap-

parently no room is left for the moral sentiments. Might has the precedence over right. The term "Leviathan" signified the State. The doctrine of the treatise is shaped to uphold the highest pretensions of the Stuart kings. Besides the direct antagonists of Hobbes, there were many eminent writers whose labors, to use the words of Mackintosh, "were excited and their doctrines modified by the stroke from a vigorous arm which seemed to shake ethics to its foundation." One of the foremost advocates of Deism

Blount,
1654-1693.

was Charles Blount. He wrote a work on the opinions of the ancients respecting the immortality of the soul, in which he covertly depreciated Christianity by showing how much was made known by "unenlightened nature." He published a translation of the "Life of Apollonius of Tyana," by Philostratus, for the sake of exhibiting a supposed parallel between the miracles told of Apollonius and those recorded in the Gospels. The "Oracles of Reason" was printed after the author's death by suicide. Blount adopts Herbert's five principles, and everything else in the religions of mankind he refers to corrupt additions made to them by priests. On the other side, Henry More affirmed that the light possessed by heathen philosophers was imparted by the divine Word, or Logos; Gale, that it was derived from the Hebrew Scriptures. Leslie's "Short and Easy Method with the Deists" was in answer to Blount. He laid down four rules by which the credibility of proof adduced for matters of fact can be tested, and sought to show that the biblical narratives are verified by the application of them. He further supports his cause by a contrast of Christianity with the three other principal religions of the world—Judaism, Heathenism, and Mohammedanism. A conspicuous part

John Locke,
1632-1704.

in the Deistic controversy was taken by John Locke, a strong advocate of the rights of free inquiry and of the duty of toleration. In his "Essay concerning Human Understanding," he defines faith to be the belief which is founded on testimony, the veracity and competence of the witnesses being first established by sufficient proof. On the subject of liberty and necessity, he is a determinist. He holds that choice is the effect of a preponderance of desire, and accords with the last dictate of the understanding, either true or illusive, as to the happiness that will result. On this point of liberty and the philosophy of choice, he confesses, in his correspondence, that he is still in the dark, although confident that the will is free. Rejecting all the attempted demonstrations of the being of God, he makes an argument for this truth from the existence of the soul, which, being wholly distinct in its

nature from matter, cannot be derived from it. His theological opinions are set forth in his work on the Epistles, and in his treatise on "The Reasonableness of Christianity." It is in this last production that he seeks to meet the objections of Deism to the religion of the Bible. He presents a system of his own which, in various particulars, is peculiar. Adam's sin brought upon the race death, or complete annihilation; they are saved from death by Christ, and the race continues; mankind, however, sin for themselves, in their probation under law; through grace, salvation is offered on the condition of faith; faith is the belief that Jesus is the Messiah; all who believe—Locke explained afterwards that he did not leave out the condition of repentance—are saved; all others perish, that is, their whole being will become extinct; the heathen may be saved by repentance and by using the light they have. Locke assigns five reasons why revelation is required. They include the desirableness of more light respecting God and duty, and new incentives and helps to a virtuous and holy life—such as the proclamation of immortal life, the example of Jesus, the aids of the Spirit. Locke was charged with leaving out of his system the Atonement. In truth, he was not a believer in the supreme divinity of Christ, and he made the legislative or teaching function of Jesus to be his principal office. He rejected the doctrines of Election and the Perseverance of the Saints, and did not adopt the prevailing view of the extent of biblical inspiration. Locke's argument, in the treatise referred to above, however it may have affected Deists, gave umbrage to orthodox believers. They found in it too large an infusion of rationalism. A year after the issue of Locke's treatise Toland published his "Christianity not Mysterious."

1695.

John Toland,
1669-1722.

He pretended to be a disciple of Locke—a relation which Locke himself repudiated. Toland went beyond the statement of Hobbes and Locke that there is nothing in Christianity contrary to reason, and asserted that there is nothing in it *above* reason. There were no mysteries, he said, in the primitive doctrine, but these have been introduced, partly in accommodation to Judaism, and partly from a mixture of philosophy. Toland wrote, also, a covert attack on the evidence for the scriptural canon, which moved Clarke to compose his "Historical Account of the Canon of the New Testament." Clarke's "Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God" was prepared as a course of "Boyle Lectures," on a foundation established by Robert Boyle, one of the founders of the Royal Society. The world—so Clarke argues—im-

Boyle,
1626-1691.

plies one self-existent, immutable being. Duration and space are not substances, but attributes. The eternity and omnipresence of that being is the inference. In carrying forward his argument, Clarke introduces observed facts, especially in proving the intelligence of the Deity.

One of the most noted, as he was one of the ablest, of the Deists was Collins. In his discourse on free-thinking he undertook to prove that the free exercise of reason is not only a right, but also that, in making a decision between competing religions, it cannot be avoided. He was answered by Bentley, the best critical scholar of the day, who chose to write under the name of a Leipsic Lover of Freedom—*Phileleutherus Lipsiensis*. Bentley claims that thinking shall be really free, and not be subject to the bias of infidel prejudice. Collins's work on the "Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion" was occasioned by Whiston's argument for Christianity from prophecy. Collins tried to make it appear that prophecy is the only valid proof, and is pertinent only on the basis of typical and allegorical interpretation. This author gained in reputation as a philosopher through his able "Inquiry concerning Liberty and Necessity," in which he anticipates many later writers by his ingenious reasoning in favor of determinism, or philosophical necessity. Woolston attacked the Christian miracles, contending for an allegorical treatment of the gospel narratives in which they are recorded. Among the replies to him was Bishop Sherlock's "Trial of the Witnesses," an argument for the historical fact of the Saviour's resurrection. Tindal's "Christianity as old as the Creation" was an endeavor to prove the sufficiency and perfection of natural religion, and to show that Christianity, as far as it is new, is a republication of this pure system, which had become overlaid with corruptions. Among the writers who took the field in opposition to him were Conybeare, Waterland, and William Law. In opposition to Waterland, Henry Dodwell, son of a learned Nonjuror of eccentric opinions, of the same name, published anonymously a pamphlet bearing the title, "Christianity not Founded on Argument." He contends ironically that the real proof of Christianity is an inner light vouchsafed to each individual separately. One assailant of Warburton's mode of defence was Conyers Middleton, the author of the "Life of Cicero," who was probably far more in sympathy with rationalistic opinions than he professed to be. In another work he attacked the credibility of the ecclesiastical miracles of the first centuries.

Anthony
Collins,
1676-1729.

Matthew
Tindal,
1657-1733.

An able discussion of this whole subject of ecclesiastical miracles as related to the miracles of the gospel, in which the statements of Hume on this subject are answered, is "The Criterion; or, Miracles Examined," by Douglas, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury.

Thomas Morgan, d. 1743.

Morgan, in his "Moral Philosopher," contended that Christianity had been corrupted by Judaism, and claimed Paul as the great free-thinker of his age. One of the most celebrated works in the Deistic controversy was occasioned by Morgan's book. This was Bishop Warburton's "Divine Legation of Moses," a work remarkable for its learning and for its ability. Warburton maintained that the silence of the Pentateuch on the subject of the future life, instead of being an evidence against the divine origin of the Hebrew religion, is a decisive argument in favor of it. This silence is without a parallel under the circumstances, and is to be explained only on the supposition that Moses was interested to protect his people from the superstitions which in Egypt had been inseparably mingled with the tenet. Chubb is a Deistic writer of inferior consequence; and the best merit of another author of the same school, Mandeville, is that he furnished the occasion for the composition of Berkeley's "Minute Philosopher," in which the principles of religion are supported, in the form of a dialogue, by cogent reasoning. Shaftesbury was one of the few Deists of rank and social position. He wrote the "Characteristics," which found fault with the gospel for making the hope of reward and the fear of punishment motives to virtue. Virtue, he affirmed, is vitiated so far as it is practised from any other motive than for its own sake. There

Bolingbroke, 1678-1751.

was one other Deist in the ranks of the nobility—Lord Bolingbroke. Profligate in his habits and unprincipled, he had a brilliant career as a statesman, until his disappointed ambition led him to join the cause of the Pretender. His style is diffuse and artificial, and he could be as vituperative as the most intolerant of theologians. He assumes that Monotheism was the primitive religion, and argues for it on the ground of the consent of all tradition that the world had a beginning. What goes beyond the creed of nature is ascribed in great part to the invention of rulers and lawgivers, who played on the fears of the mass of the people in order to keep them in subjection. Bolingbroke is less consistent in his theories than most of the champions of Deism. He left his writings on this subject to be published by his literary executor, one Mallet, who was a Scot. When Boswell asked Johnson his opinion of Bolingbroke, the gruff oracle answered: "Sir, he was a scoundrel and a coward; a scoundrel for charging a blunderbuss against religion

and morality ; a coward because he had no resolution to fire it off himself, but left half a crown to a beggarly Scotchman to draw the trigger after his death."

There were writers towards the close of the century to whom the appellation of "infidel" seems peculiarly fitting. Hume was a philosophical antagonist who confined himself to reasoning in a temperate tone and in a metaphysical vein. Gibbon, on the contrary, was the most distinguished of the class whose method was "to sap a creed with solemn sneer." Late in the century, Thomas

Thomas Paine, 1737-1809. Paine, just as he was having a narrow escape from the

guillotine, while Robespierre was in power, composed "The Age of Reason." He wrote in a racy style, and, although he has passages in a worthier tone, he easily falls into a strain of coarseness and ribaldry. His treatment of the Bible is equally supercilious and superficial.

It is obvious that the main tenet of Deism was borrowed from Christianity. That is to say, Monotheism, practically regarded,

Defects of Deism.

came to the European nations through the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament. The defenders of Deism, while they rejected the miracles recorded in the Bible, accepted the most stupendous miracle of all—the miracle of creation. This led frequently to a real, though unconscious, inconsistency in their temper of feeling, if not in their reasoning, on the subject. They held to the postulates of the gospel, the doctrine of one God and of sin, but they grasped this last truth with so little thoroughness of conviction and vividness of emotion that they did not feel the need of the gospel as a means of forgiveness and a source of help in the conflict with evil in the soul. It must be said that the defenders of the faith too often failed likewise to appreciate this moral and spiritual office of the gospel, and therefore dwelt too exclusively on the external evidences.

In the department of Christian evidences, a commotion was created by the publication of Hume's "Essay on Miracles." His

Hume on miracles.

object is to show, not that miracles are impossible, but that they cannot be proved. He starts with the assumption that belief is founded on experience. This statement needs to be corrected, since trust is spontaneous, however it may be checked and regulated by an acquaintance with the world. He argues that, since we have no experience of a miracle, and have experience of the error of testimony, no amount of testimony will suffice to prove an alleged miracle. The falsehood of the testimony is less improbable than the "transgression"—as he terms it

—of a law of nature. He errs in *assuming* that experience is all adverse to the occurrence of a miracle. The evidence for this assertion, as John Stuart Mill has clearly stated, is “diminished in force by whatever weight belongs to the evidence that certain miracles have taken place.” Hume’s whole argument, moreover, presupposes that we have no knowledge that there is a God, and that, if He exist, he would as soon suspend a law which justifies belief in the testimony of witnesses, as suspend a natural law—for example, by the healing of a blind man—for the sake of proving a merciful revelation. Hume endeavored to fortify his reasoning by adducing instances of alleged miracles, like the Jansenist wonders at the tomb of the Abbè Paris, which seemed to be well supported by testimony. Hume’s essay called out numerous rejoinders, not all of which succeeded in exposing its sophistry. The most popular writer in defence of natural and revealed religion, was

William Paley,
1743–1805.

Paley. His “Natural Theology,” and his “Evidences of Christianity,” although not marked by original contributions of thought, are models of lucidity and method. The materials for his work on “Christian Evidences,” were drawn in great part from the learned writings of Nathaniel Lardner. The “*Horæ Paulinæ*,” of Paley is a more original production, and as ingenious as it is original. It points out undesigned coincidences between the narrative in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, and thus presents a striking proof of the authenticity of all these documents. The ablest work on the Evidences which the eigh-

Joseph Butler,
1692–1752.

teenth century produced is the “*Analogy*” of Bishop Butler, in which that profound thinker overthrows the objections to the principles of religion and of Christianity, by showing that they would lie equally against what we plainly observe in the constitution and course of nature.

England produced in the earlier section of this era a trio of metaphysicians of the highest ability, whose writings bore directly on religious discussions. Locke, in his “*Essay on the*

Philosophy in
England ;
John Locke.

Human Understanding,” traced our knowledge to sensation and reflection, but in this original and masterly treatise he failed to define the second of these terms in such a way as to preclude the reference of all our ideas to sensation as their ultimate source. Nor did he make it clear that we perceive external reality in any other way than by means of intermediate im-

George Berke-
ley, 1684–1753.

pressions on the mind. Berkeley, a divine and Bishop of Cloyne, who merited the eulogy of Pope ascribing to him “every virtue under heaven,” sought an impregnable de-

fence of theism in an ideal theory of matter. Only minds exist. The notion of a hard lump of matter is a figment of fancy. External objects are nothing more or less than ideas imparted to the mind, according to a fixed order, by the divine mind, in which, as archetypes, they originally reside. Nature is the succession or connection of these ideas, and the laws of nature denote the method of their association with one another. In ethics Berkeley held that the well-being of the race in all times and nations is the end which the Deity sets before himself. To this end all human actions should aim. The rules of morality are a generalized statement of the bearing of different sorts of conduct on this end, or

David Hume,
1711-1776.

of their proper tendency and results. Hume, on the foundation of premises which he professed to derive from Locke, erected a fabric of philosophical scepticism. As neither cause, substance, power, or the *ego* (self) are known through the senses, we have no warrant to affirm their reality. Cause is only another term for the uniform succession of phenomena, which customary association leads us to regard as necessary, or as somehow linked together by a hidden bond. If we have always seen one thing follow another, we instinctively and necessarily expect the second when the first occurs, and we transfer, without warrant, this necessity to the things themselves. Belief itself is simply the product of habitual association of mental states. The freedom of the will is likewise resolved into an illusive inference. The scepticism of Hume stimulated Reid, the founder of the Scotch

Thomas Reid,
1710-1796.

tish school of philosophy, to bring forward the doctrine of common sense. The validity of the ideas of power, substance, cause, etc., is immediately assured to the mind, which is the direct source of these ideas. We have a direct or face-to-face perception of the external world: its reality is not an inference from some intermediate object of perception. With these names may be con-

joined the name of a fourth metaphysician, who was

Samuel Clarke,
1675-1729.

equally eminent in mathematics and physical science, and was competent to carry forward a debate with Leibnitz—Dr. Samuel Clarke. Among other tenets which he defended was the freedom of the will, in opposition to determinism.

The three principal writers on ethics in England, in the last century, were Butler, Price, and Paley. Bishop Butler, to whose writings on the evidences of religion we have already referred, made a threefold division of human nature into passions and affections, self-love and benevolence, and conscience. Each of the passions goes out to its corresponding object. Both self-love and

benevolence are principles native to the soul, not inconsistent with one another, but to be exercised each in due proportion to the other. Conscience is the regulative faculty, defining this proportion and binding to its observance. Equal love to self and to one's neighbor, with supreme love to God, constitute the sum of duty. Veracity and justice are sometimes treated as branches of benevolence—safeguards against a want of foresight of the consequences of actions. Sometimes it is intimated that they are paral-

Richard Price, 1723-1791, lel with benevolence and more independent. Price de-

fended the doctrine that right is a simple idea, not capable of being resolved into other constituents. His views were akin to the subsequent theory of Kant. Paley was the expounder and advocate of the utilitarian theory of morals. He defines virtue as the "doing good to mankind, in obedience to the will of God, and for the sake of everlasting happiness." The chief good is hap-

Francis
Hutcheson,
1694-1747.

piness; the springs of virtue are in self-love. At the opposite pole stands Hutcheson, who had identified virtue with general benevolence to which he said that we

must have regard in every action that partakes of virtue. Adam

Adam Smith,
1723-1790.

Smith attempted to deduce the feelings of conscience from sympathy, or fellow-feeling with others, but failed

to explain the imperative character of conscience. His highest distinction was that of being the founder of economical science. Hartley and Tucker sought in other and different ways for the genesis of moral feelings and principles.

Calvinism, in the Church of England, in the last century, had

Thomas Scott,
1747-1821.

but few prominent advocates. Among them were Scott, and Toplady, the author of the familiar hymn,

"Rock of Ages! cleft for me;
Let me hide myself in thee!"

Toplady and John Wesley engaged in a controversy which was marked on both sides by a vigor of denunciation unusual even among polemical divines. The principal defenders of

Augustus
Toplady,
1740-1778.

Calvinism were Dissenters. We have to notice in this period the change of theory, by which the idea of federal

representation on the part of Adam, who as an individual undergoes a probation for his posterity, is substituted for the Augustinian realistic conception of the solidarity of the race, and the literal participation of all in the first progenitor's transgression. A philosophy more in accord with Nominalism supplants the Pla-

tonic Realism of former times. Our consanguinity with Adam, or his natural headship, is one main reason assigned for the covenant by which he is constituted our representative, but his act, properly speaking, is that of an individual. The effect of this modification of theory was to lead to the attributing to the posterity of Adam of a diminished degree of responsibility for his offence, and to a certain embarrassment and vacillation which belong to the whole discussion of the doctrine of human depravity. Solutions are broached only to be abandoned, or are confessed to be inadequate. This peculiar state of mind is manifest in Ridgley, and still more in Doddridge and in Watts, and in the Scottish theologian, George Hill. On other points, we find in Doddridge and Watts an obvious departure from the tenets of strict Calvinism. Doddridge's defini-

Philip Doddridge,
1702-1751.

tion of election would not be seriously complained of by an Arminian or a Lutheran. On the subject of the Trinity, while he does not sanction the Arian view, he enjoins moderation and caution on so difficult a theme. On this subject, Watts advanced a peculiar opinion. He held to the pre-existence of the human nature of Christ, which

Isaac Watts,
1674-1748.

was the first of created beings, and had existed in a mysterious ineffable union with God the Father. This relation to God renders Christ both a man and an object of worship. Whether the Spirit is a person in the Godhead, he says that we do not know.

The transition from Calvinism in England to New England divinity is natural. The founder of New England theology, as a

New England
theology;
Edwards,
1703-1758.

distinct type of doctrine, was Jonathan Edwards. The English Arminian writers, in particular Whitby, and Dr.

John Tayler, of Norwich, were read with approbation by ministers on this side of the water. There was much of that emasculated form of Calvinism which the younger Edwards refers to as characteristic of Watts and Doddridge, and which his father and his father's followers, through their "improvements" in theology, aimed to supersede by setting up in its place a stricter and, at the same time, a tenable system. In short, Edwards undertook to fortify the essential principles of Calvinism against its Arminian assailants. This purpose led to modifications in forms of statement and, to some extent, in doctrinal conceptions. In his treatise on the "Will," Edwards discloses the influence which Locke had exerted upon his thought. With much acuteness and controversial skill, he maintains determinism, or philosophical necessity, and the prior certainty of all choices, which is secured by the antecedent motives. This certainty he distinguishes from necessity, in what

he considers the proper sense of this term, which would imply some sort of constraint on the inclination; but the "inclination" is identified with the choice. Thus he is enabled to affirm a "natural ability" in sinful men to reverse their evil preferences of will, while a "moral inability," or fixed unwillingness, renders it certain that this reversal will never occur, independently of regenerating grace from above. In a posthumous treatise on "Original Sin," Edwards plants himself on the realistic idea of a common sin of the race in Adam, which renders the individual responsible for the bent of the will which he brings into the world at his birth, and thus a partaker in the guilt of the primal transgression. In a dissertation on the nature of virtue, which he makes to consist in "love to being in general," or benevolence, he makes a distinction between the rectitude of this holy love, which all minds recognize, and the beauty or sweetness which belongs to the exercise of it, which is revealed only to experience, and hence belongs to the regenerate alone. The contrast of natural and holy affections is more fully made in his book on the "Affections," in which the mystical turn that belonged to him is apparent—the tendency which is manifest, for example, in his sermon on the nature of spiritual light. The breadth of thought of which Edwards was capable is evinced in his essay on "God's Chief End in Creation," which is made to be the communication of all the good, both natural and moral, that is in him; and in his book on the "History of Redemption," in which he rises to the consideration of the comprehensive plan of God in history.

The writings of Edwards had the effect to create a school of divines called "Edwardeans," or "New Divinity Men," or "New Lights." They were cordial friends of the Revival of 1740. They were regarded with some suspicion, at the outset, by strict adherents of the forms of statement in the Westminster Creeds, and they continued to be opposed by the moderate Calvinists and by the Arminians. The followers of Edwards generally united in discarding the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and in holding that the native depravity of the individual is the ordained consequence of that sin, in virtue of a Divine constitution; in substituting "moral inability" for the unqualified helplessness of sinful men, and in the advocacy of a universal instead of a limited atonement. At the same time, they asserted, with emphasis, divine sovereignty and the Calvinistic tenet of election. Hopkins, a pupil of Edwards, and the founder of a party designated as "Hopkinsians," taught the duty of

The school of
Edwards.

Samuel
Hopkins,
1721-1803.

"unconditional resignation." He presented in a logical style a doctrine of submission to the Divine will, not materially diverse from a view which mystics in different ages have cherished. The doctrine of disinterested benevolence he developed in a form accordant with the tenet just described. All sin he resolved into selfishness. He affirmed that all actions, even the prayers, of impenitent men are sinful, repentance being the duty first in order. Hence, it is wrong to exhort men to pray for their own conversion. In his theodicy, sin is considered an evil in itself, to be sure, but the necessary

Joseph
Bellamy,
1719-1790.

means of the greatest good. This last opinion was elaborately defended by Bellamy, a powerful preacher in Connecticut, of the Edwardean school. Smalley set

John Smalley,
1734-1820.

forth the Edwardean view of "natural ability" to repent, love God, and believe in Christ. The younger

Jonathan
Edwards, Jr.,
1745-1801.

Edwards expounded the governmental theory of the atonement, in a view not very dissimilar from that of Grotius; and this theory took its place as an accepted

Nathaniel
Emmons,
1745-1840.

principle of New England theology. Emmons exhibited, in a precise form, the peculiar opinions of Hop-

kings as to "unconditional resignation," "disinterested benevolence," and "Divine efficiency" in the production of human choices, and pushed them to consequences which, if they were logical, were repugnant to many adherents of the New England school. All sin, and all holiness as well, he resolved into exercises, or acts of will, each distinct from every other, and each perfect in its kind. But theologians in his time, and earlier, did not draw a sharp line between the will and the sensibility or affections.

Burton taught that regeneration is a change in the spiritual taste, by which a relish for divine things is imparted, and precedes

Asa Burton,
1752-1836.

"exercises," or holy volitions. President Dwight, of Yale College, rejected the doctrine of imputation of

Timothy
Dwight,
1752-1817.

Adam's sin, of natural inability, and of limited atonement. He rejected, also, the Hopkinsian view of Divine efficiency, and was, in general, a moderate Calvinist

in his teaching in respect to Divine decrees. He held with Burton and the younger Edwards, that regeneration is the gift of a new spiritual taste, and he maintained, against Hopkins and Emmons, that it is lawful for impenitent men to pray for conversion. Virtue

Nathaniel
W. Taylor,
1786-1858.

he founded on utility, making the excellence of virtue to consist in its tendency to promote the highest happiness. By N. W. Taylor, a pupil of Dwight, further

variations in the New England system were introduced, which

produced a lasting effect and wide-spread controversy. He explicitly included in "natural ability" a continued and perpetual "power of contrary choice," existing in connection with the prior certainty of choices, and the permanence of the "governing principle" of character in the unconverted, apart from the intervention of grace to move them to a change. He denied that sin is "the necessary means of the greatest good," and held that moral evil, while it springs exclusively from the will of the creature, is permitted because its exclusion by the fiat of the Deity may be inconsistent necessarily with the best possible moral system. The opinions of Dr. Taylor on these and some other points were opposed, not only by such as rejected the peculiarities of New England theology in general, but also by a large party among its advocates, by whom these opinions were regarded as Semi-Pelagian.

Division of
the Presby-
terian Church.

In the Presbyterian Church, in the Middle States, where New England influences prevailed, the tenets of the Edwardean school had always found favor. Where there prevailed influences derived from Scotland, a type of Calvinism more strict and more exactly conformed to the Federal system and to the Westminster Creeds was in vogue. After the publication and diffusion of Dr. Taylor's views, conflict broke out between these opposing tendencies. We have before adverted to the fact that, mingled with doctrinal differences, there was some discord in ecclesiastical matters. It has been already stated that Albert Barnes and Lyman Beecher, eminent ministers, were impeached before the Presbyterian ecclesiastical courts for heresy. The American Presbyterian Church was divided into two bodies, which remained disunited until the gradual subsidence of theological contention and agreement in Church affairs brought to pass a reunion. Of the theologians of the "Old School," Dr. Charles Hodge was an able and learned representative. The New England theology had its "Old School" and "New School" advocates. Of the latter class, Edwards A. Park was one of the most acute and influential expounders. Midway between these and the Presbyterians of the "Old School," to whom reference has just been made, were divines, among whom Henry B. Smith was justly eminent for his penetrating insight and for the variety, as well as extent, of his learning.

Henry B.
Smith,
1815-1877.

Oberlin
theology.

A modified form of the "New School" theology was presented in the writings of Asa Mahan and Charles G. Finney, theologians connected with the institutions at Oberlin, Ohio. They taught that since man's ability is commensurate

with his obligation, and goodness consists wholly in the governing purpose, Christian perfection is practicable and a duty. Dr. Finney (1792-1875) was not only an acute thinker, but a revival preacher who exerted an extensive influence for a long time by his work as an evangelist. The Oberlin theologians, while laying emphasis on human ability, rejected the Pelagian doctrine, and insisted on the need of the Holy Spirit's agency. A critical position in relation to the New England theology in its later develop-

Bushnell. ments, was taken by Horace Bushnell. In his book on "Christian Nurture" (1847), he insisted on the value of religious education and family training, and sharply censured an undue reliance on revivals as means of planting and fostering the Christian life. In other writings, to be hereafter noticed, he presented new views respecting the incarnation and the atonement.

In the ecclesiastical history of New England, the rise of Unitarianism is an event of capital importance. In England, in the last century, Unitarianism, which had been adopted by not a few Presbyterians, was publicly defended by Joseph Priestley (1733-1804), who is also distinguished for his

Unitarianism
in New Eng-
land.

scientific attainments and discoveries, as well as for his advocacy of liberalism in politics in the exciting days at the opening of the French Revolution. Priestley was a necessarian in his philosophy. He had for an antagonist the celebrated Bishop Horsley. Another prominent Unitarian in England was Thomas Belsham (1750-1829), a preacher and a voluminous writer. Unitarianism in New England was an offshoot of the Arminianism which had taken the place of the older Puritan theology. There arose an extensive repugnance to the Calvinistic tenets in any sharp form of statement, and a disposition to dwell on the precepts rather than the doctrines of the Christian system. The writings of the English Arminians and Arians were read. As early as 1750 there were a number of ministers and many laymen about Boston who were Unitarians in their belief. The effect of the Great Revival of 1740 was to cause the difference of theological and religious tendencies to be more distinctly felt. The extravagances of Hopkinsianism, as they were deemed, reinforced the revolt against the old creed of which it claimed to be a consistent explanation. The discussions about human rights, which preceded the American Revolution, helped to draw away attention from questions of theological doctrine, and to bring into prominence, not only questions relative to natural and political rights, but the ethical aspects of the gospel generally. In 1784, Charles Chauncy, a distinguished minister of Boston,

defended the opinion that all are finally saved. The younger Edwards published a book in reply to him. An event of importance in leading to a division among Congregationalists was the election of Henry Ware, a Unitarian, as Hollis Professor of Divinity at Harvard College, in 1805; and another occurrence in the same

William Ellery
Channing,
1780-1842.

direction was a sermon of Channing at Baltimore, in 1819. Channing became the most impressive and the most famous of the Unitarian preachers. The purity

and elevation of his character were generally admired. In the world of letters his high rank was everywhere recognized. While studiously avoiding language of bitter reproach or denunciation, he wrote earnestly in behalf of the anti-slavery cause. Not only did literary studies flourish among the Unitarians; they produced scholars, in biblical learning, of high merit. One of them was

Andrews
Norton,
1786-1853.

Andrews Norton, the author of a work on "The Genuineness of the Gospels." Channing discarded the received doctrine of the depravity of human nature. He

brought into prominence the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of mankind. He held that Jesus was an angel or spirit incarnate; but the humanitarian view of the person of Christ gradually became the more common opinion among American Unitarians. Channing held that the death of Christ, in some way inscrutable to us, had "a special influence in removing punishment;" but he did not accentuate this opinion, and this idea of the Atonement was not usually a part of the Unitarian creed. In the controversy that took place between "the orthodox" and the Unitarians, Stuart, a

Moses Stuart,
1780-1852.

learned biblical scholar at Andover, and Woods, Professor of Doctrinal Theology in the same institution, were noted defenders of the old creed, while Channing himself, Norton, and others, wrote on their side of the discussion. An ecclesiastical separation took place;

Leonard
Woods,
1774-1854.

churches were divided; the exchange of pulpits among ministers of the contending parties ceased. The Unitarians were zealous in the promotion of education and practical philanthropy. They did not enlist in the work of domestic and foreign missions, which their opponents prosecuted with unabated and increasing ardor. The principal seat of Unitarianism was eastern New England. It has been one of the minor denominations as far as numbers are concerned, but from its high culture, and from the numerous persons of literary distinction connected with it, its influence has been strongly felt.

The revolution of opinion did not stop at the point to which it

was carried by Channing and his associates. The next step was the development of an intuitional theory of religion by the class called "Transcendentalists." This new phase of religious thought was owing in part to the influence of Spinoza, and of Schleiermacher and the contemporary German philosophers. It counted historical facts as of no essential value in a religious system. It differed from the older Unitarianism in exalting intuition, and in the decided Pantheistic trend which characterized it. Ralph

R. W. Emerson,
son,
1803-1882.

Waldo Emerson, a poet, and a prose writer of subtle insight and with a compact felicity of expression, was the most noted exponent of this mode of thought. "Every

man his own prophet," seemed to be the accepted maxim. A periodical was founded by this school, called "The Dial." Theodore

Theodore
Parker,
1810-1860.

Parker, who sympathized with this new phase of speculation, openly denied the historical reality of the gospel miracles. In his "Discourse of Religion," and else-

where, he taught that Christianity is the product of natural reason, and a stage in the progress of man's religious development. Yet he did not abandon theism, and he believed in prayer. Channing deplored the appearance of this disbelief in a supernatural gospel. It was earnestly combated by Norton, who, with the older Socinians, maintained that "no proof of the divine commission of Jesus could be afforded" except by miracles. For a considerable period, the more conservative Unitarians declined all ecclesiastical union with the adherents of Parker. Subsequently a loosely organized party arose, who styled themselves advocates of "Free Religion," a term which they variously, if not vaguely, defined. Christianity was classified by them in the same category with other religions, all of which they handled in an eclectic spirit.

The Universalist denomination began in America with the preaching of John Murray (1741-1815), an Englishman, a convert to Methodism, and, for a time, a Methodist preacher.

The Universalists.

He espoused the doctrine of the final salvation of all, which he preached along the Atlantic seaboard, but principally in New England, from 1770 until his death in 1815. He was a trinitarian in his belief. Walter Balfour (c. 1776-1852), a Presbyterian minister from Scotland, preached Universalism in America, and wrote in behalf of this tenet. But the most effective agent in promoting the cause of the Universalists, and in giving definite form to their creed, was Hosea Ballou (1771-1852). They have acknowledged the authority of the Scriptures as a divine revelation. They have not accepted the doctrine of the Trinity, of the divinity

of Christ, or of an expiatory atonement. For a considerable period, after the influence of Murray died out, the Universalists, with the exception of a small minority who were called "Restorationists," disbelieved in future punishment altogether. In more recent times, they have generally returned to a belief in restorationism. They have established schools and colleges, and in the spirit of devotion, as well as in the encouragement given to education, they have made a remarkable advance. They secure unity by means of state and national conventions, in which laymen as well as the ministers bear a part.

On the continent of Europe the spirit of rationalism found an incarnate expression in Voltaire. He "was the very eye of the eighteenth century illumination." In his writings he illustrates that divorce of literature from religion which gives to the most brilliant literary work a shallow and unsatisfying quality and a transitory life. In the world of letters, more than was true of any man since Erasmus, he was an oracle. Poet, dramatist, critic, historian, he sent forth from the press fourscore volumes. His vivacity never failed. His wit was as quick and as scorching as a flash of lightning. Cruelty, and especially the cruelty that sprung from religious intolerance, he regarded with intense indignation. He was not without a generous compassion for the afflicted. Lacking the insight and the disposition to distinguish the true religion of the gospel from its counterfeits, and from superstitions and odious practices which had linked themselves to it, he waged war against the whole creed of the Church. He believed, however, in a personal God. His vanity was insatiable. For the indecency that is specially revolting in one of his dramas, apologists have nothing more to say in the way of excuse than that he was not worse than his contemporaries. A recent biographer, whose own opinions dispose him to sympathy with Voltaire, remarks that "he missed the peculiar emotion of holiness," "had no ear for the finer vibrations of the spiritual voice," was moved by "a vehement and blinding antipathy" to the Christian faith, and, in his crusade against the Bible, delighted "in the minute cavils of literary pyrrhonism." How could an appreciation of the true spirit of the Bible be expected from one who gives small praise to Homer, and speaks of Shakespeare with contempt? Yet the measure of truth in his arraignment of Christianity, as it existed in its organized form at that time in France, made a powerful impression. There was a multitude, moreover, with whom a clever gibe was more potent than a sound argument. Condillac (1715-1780) professed to de-

Voltaire,
1694-1778.

duce from Locke a bold materialism, which he explained in a book that Voltaire himself said was full of commonplaces. Helvetius (1715-1771), in the work entitled "*De l'Esprit*," traced virtue to self-interest, made physical enjoyment the object of self-love, and identified morality with selfishness.

The Deism of Voltaire was followed by the materialism and atheism of the Encyclopædists, a class of writers so named from the copious work of Diderot and D'Alembert—the "Encyclopédie," which was allied in spirit to these extremes of infidelity. Diderot was himself a man of versatile talents, of extensive learning, and of prodigious industry in the prosecution of study. The opinions just referred to were explicitly taught in "*The System of Nature*," of which Baron Holbach (1723-1789), a German by birth, was the author. God, freedom, and the future life were treated as chimeras, and duty was resolved into a form of self-gratification.

Of a different spirit was Rousseau, in whom irregularities of thought and immoralities in conduct were connected with traits of genius and moods of feeling, and with an eloquence of style, which had for his contemporaries a peculiar fascination. He had an equal skill in describing human emotions and scenes in nature. His "*Émile*" is a treatise on education, in the form of a novel, in which the author's creed is a sentimental deism. His own children he sent to a foundling hospital. Late in life he went through a form of marriage with their mother, who was an illiterate bar-maid. She was, however, faithful in her relations to him. The "*Confessions*," with their disgusting acknowledgments of early vice, were written in his later years, when his excessively morbid temperament had passed the limit of sanity. His merit as a writer has been well condensed in the statement that "in expressing the effect of nature on the feelings, and of the feelings on the aspect of nature, he was absolutely without a forerunner or a model."

Before we proceed to review the course of modern German theology, a place must be found for a great writer, whose career falls mainly within the bounds of the seventeenth century. He was a philosopher whose profound and various talents made him almost the peer of Aristotle. This was Leibnitz, eminent alike as a mathematician and naturalist, a metaphysician and theologian, besides being versed in political affairs. He aimed to remedy the defects of Des Cartes and

The Encyclo-
pædists.

Diderot,
1713-1784.

Rousseau,
1712-1778.

Gottfried
Wilhelm
Leibnitz,
1646-1716.

the errors of Spinoza. In place of the substance, "one and simple," which Spinoza had assumed to exist, he held to a multiplicity of "monads"—unextended centres of force—indivisible and independent, yet working together according to "the pre-established harmony" which the Creator has arranged. The exertion of His agency is never intermitted. The motion of the arm is made to coincide in time with the volition to move it. Besides what comes to us through the senses, the mind originates ideas which are innate in the sense that they spring up within us in virtue of our mental constitution. To the maxim, that there is "nothing in the intellect that was not before in the sensory," Leibnitz added, "except the intellect itself." His efforts to unite the contending churches are a monument of the liberality of his mind. In his "Theodicy" he took up the problem of evil. Natural evil, or suffering, may be desirable, if sin exists. As to moral evil, it grows out of free-will, and is permitted, because out of all possible systems, the best involves this *permission* of sin on the part of the Creator. As to the occasion of sin, or of its possibility, it is made by Leibnitz to be the finite constitution of the creature, which opens a door for undue excitement of sensibility in a particular direction, and for error and delusion. In his theory of the will he favors determinism. The philosophy of Leibnitz was reduced to a more systematic form by Wolf.

Period of De-
istic ration-
alism.

The history of Rationalism in Germany divides itself into several eras, which, however, do not follow each other in a strict chronological series, but in some instances overlap one another. In the first era, the influence of the Anglo-French Deism was dominant in the higher classes of society. It was the period of boasted "illumination," or *Aufklärung*. This rationalistic spirit was fostered by the example of Frederic II. The rigorous training, including a sort of drill in religious exercises, to which his righteous but stern father subjected him, provoked a reaction and revolt, like that which was experienced by the Emperor Julian under the tuition ordained by his cousin. Voltaire, at the invitation of Frederic, resided for a while at his court as a companion, until a quarrel separated them. They afterwards resumed their correspondence, which, however, was well spiced with mutual reproaches. Against the reigning French infidelity, "Pietism," useful as it was, was a protest on the side of religious feeling rather than a scientific refutation. The Moravian movement, in some degree its offspring, was helpful in counteracting the effect of unbelief and of the frigid orthodoxy which existed along with it.

In this era falls the career of the great critic and poet, Lessing, whose genius stimulated and guided the development of German literature and art. Lessing's religious position was somewhat unique. He published the "Wolfenbüttel Fragments," an attack by Reimarus on the credibility of the Gospel records of miracles. This he did, as he explained, in the interest of free and fearless investigation, of which he was a life-long champion. In the drama of "Nathan the Wise," he sought to commend and illustrate the idea that the creed is of little moment, provided there is a spirit of tolerance and charity. In his essay on the "Education of Humanity," he presented the theory that historical religions, even Christianity, are provisional anticipations of truth, which, in process of time, becomes evident to reason. The form in which they clothe this truth must be distinguished by a critical examination from the substantial contents. The religious ideas of Lessing are best expressed in this very suggestive book, but it is doubtful whether he ever reached in his thought conclusions which he regarded as final. The gospel of indifferentism, which was expounded in "Nathan the Wise," attracted to itself numerous disciples.

The era of the Rationalistic criticism of the Bible and of early Christian history was opened by Semler (1725-1791). The work of scientific criticism in these departments had been commenced by the eminent Arminian scholars, Episcopius, Wettstein, Le Clerc, and others. Semler was a professor at Halle. He drew a distinct line between religion and theology. He challenged, on a multitude of points, the traditional assumptions respecting the origin of the books of the Bible and the correctness of the text, and called in question received views concerning the early history of the Church. His propositions were often rash and untenable, but a lively curiosity in all these provinces of inquiry was awakened in the German universities. There were scholars who were still orthodox, but with a decided leaven of liberalism, whose theology, however, had in it little of the warmth of life. Such were John David Michaelis (1717-1791), a learned Orientalist at Göttingen, and John Lawrence Mosheim (c. 1694-1755), a faithful and erudite student of Church history, and the author of meritorious writings in this branch, as well as a preacher of note in his day. Griesbach (1745-1812) gave, at Jena, an example of boldness before unknown in the textual criticism of the New Testament. Eichhorn (1752-1827) lectured three hours a day for fifty-two years, first at Jena and then at Göttingen, bring-

Period of Rationalistic criticism.

ing forward fruitful suggestions in biblical criticism, mingling with them numerous opinions having no adequate ground, and proposing doubts and problems, in the solution of which many a conscientious student spent his lifetime. In his "Introduction to the Old Testament," he brought forward the theory that Genesis is composed of two documents, in one of which the name of God is Elohim, and in the other, Jehovah. By these marks the parallel narratives are distinguished from one another. Spinoza had hazarded the assertion that the Pentateuch was not written by Moses. The documentary hypothesis relative to Genesis, of which book Moses was still conceived to be the editor, was propounded first by Astruc, a learned French physician (1684-1766). Taken up by Eichhorn, it led the way to the subsequent discussion respecting the authorship of the Pentateuch and of Joshua, in which De Wette, Bleek, Ewald, Hupfeld, and, more recently, Kuenen, Graf, Reuss, and Wellhausen, are among the eminent participants. But this was only one of the problems which Eichhorn left for his successors to solve. In this period lived Herder (1744-1803), court-preacher at Weimar, but better known as a man of letters and a stimulating author on historical and theological topics. Belonging to no school, he was able, by his insight and poetic feeling, to awaken a deep and appreciative interest in the Scriptures from a point of view to which contemporary writers were strangers. His inspiring suggestions were of much value, even though the æsthetic impulse was predominant in his theological writings—for example, in his "Spirit of Hebrew Poetry"—but he was not very definite in his grasp of the essential doctrines of the gospel.

We come now to the era of the Critical Philosophy and of the systems of theology that were built upon it. Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) was "roused from his dogmatic slumber" by the skepticism of Hume. He set out, in his "Critique of the Pure Reason," to analyze the knowing faculty and to point out what is contributed, in the stock of knowledge, by the mind itself in distinction from the outward world. He demonstrated that the ideas of cause, substance, etc., are necessary and universal; they spring up within us, and are not imparted from without. But in this analysis he found no ground for asserting their reality as objects exterior to the mind. What they make known is the mechanism of the understanding. Moreover, the ideas of God, of the freedom of the will, of self as a substantial reality, are, to be sure, suggested by the reason as distinguished from the understanding, but they cannot be grasped and reasoned

The Kantian
philosophy
and theology.

upon without our being caught in a mesh of contradictions. They are simply ideas, having a regulative office for our thoughts, binding them together in unity. They serve to give harmony to the mental world within us. This was a refutation of Hume, but it was an organization of skepticism in a new form. In his "Critique of the Practical Reason," Kant rescued the truths which had thus been surrendered. They are verified by our moral nature. We are conscious of the moral law as an imperative mandate binding on the will, in contravention of the desires which have respect to happiness. Thus we are assured of the freedom of the will. Of the being of God, the moral Ruler, we are justly convinced by the need that duty and personal happiness should be made to coincide. For a like reason we infer the immortality of the soul. God, freedom, and immortality were thus the three articles in the Kantian theological creed. Religion was defined to be the recognition of our duties as Divine commands. The ethical law is that we shall act in such a way that the act may be generalized into a maxim, and thus bring no contradiction into the will. Virtue has worth only so far as the motive is obedience to the law of conscience. Christianity was said to have no other function or value than as an aid to morality. Hence the ethical element of the gospel was magnified. The supernatural features of the gospel record were to be explained away by a flexible method of interpretation. Historical or "statutory" religion was a crutch for the feeble, which the strong might discard.

The moral earnestness of Kant, which gave a tone of dignity and elevation to his philosophical system, made a favorable impression on a class of theologians. They sought to eliminate supernaturalism from the Scriptures by devices of interpretation. Much use was made of the idea of accommodation. Jesus and his apostles, it was held, indulged the Jews in numerous errors of belief which were harmless, yet too deeply planted for them to eradicate. Paulus (1761-1851), professor at Heidelberg, carried through the Bible the naturalistic method of explanation, which referred the narratives of miracles to an unconscious exaggeration on the part of the witnesses—a theory corresponding to that of Euhemerus in relation to the heathen tales of the gods. To help out this hypothesis, an extraordinary knowledge of remedies for disease, and a remarkable psychical influence, were ascribed to Christ. Such theologians as Wegscheider (1771-1849) resolved the gospel into a system of natural theism and of exalted ethical precepts. Preachers there were, like the celebrated Reinhard

Naturalistic
Rationalism.

(1753–1812), who, while they conceded much to the new philosophical theology, still upheld the leading doctrines of the Reformation.

In opposition to the Kantian Rationalism, Jacobi (1743–1819) propounded a philosophy which made God, freedom, and the future

life the objects of an immediate belief. This instinctive faith, which is founded in a necessity of feeling, he termed an act of reason—thus widening the function of

The philosophy of Feeling; Jacobi.

the faculty to which Kant had given this name. The fervid and eloquent writings of Jacobi strongly affected the educated class. This reaction was powerfully reinforced by a teacher of masterly ability, by whom a new era in evangelical theology was founded,

Frederick Schleiermacher. In his system of doctrine, the sphere of dogmatic theology, which is made to be a formulated expression of the consciousness of the Church

Schleiermacher, 1768–1834.

at any given time, is limited to an analysis of the Christian's inward religious experience. Religion is defined to be the feeling of absolute dependence. The correlate in God of this feeling is original causal agency, into which his attributes, as far as they are disclosed to us, are merged and resolved. Christian piety is that piety which is conscious of itself as an effect of the Redeemer's influence. Sin is the control of the flesh over the spirit—the same in the first man as in us. Redemption is the reversal of this relation, the victory of the spirit over the flesh. This is wrought out in Christ by his conquest over temptation and the extremity of trial, and is imparted to all who attach themselves to him in trustful dependence. They become partakers of his holiness and of his peace. Sin is in them a vanishing element, and physical evil, its penalty, vanishes with it. In his idea of the Saviour's person, Schleiermacher falls below the orthodox conception. Christ is said to realize in himself the ideal of humanity; in his consciousness, the perfection of fellowship with God. This life of spiritual union to God goes forth from him to the society of believers. Schleiermacher's theory of the Trinity is Sabellian. Expiation, in the ordinary sense, is not admitted. Restorationism is maintained. The entire system is tinged with a pantheistic mode of thought, which is partly caught from Spinoza. Notwithstanding these features, Schleiermacher's theology, besides the marvellous symmetry and logical coherence that belong to it, contains many thoughts so profound and so truly Christian, and awards so high—even if it be too exclusive—a place to feeling, which the Kantians had almost expelled from religion, that it was welcomed as a well of water in a desert. With Schleiermacher there began a new direction of

theological thought, a new construction of Christian doctrine. His labors as a preacher, as a philosopher—he translated all the writings of Plato—and as a teacher, mark a new epoch in the history of theology.

Before tracing the effects of Schleiermacher's influence, it is requisite to point out the course which philosophy took, owing, in part, to certain elements in the system of Kant. A succession of Pantheistic philosophers entered on a field of speculation which fascinated many minds. This movement began with Fichte and Schelling, and culminated in the elaborate system of pantheism of which Hegel (1770-1831) was the author. The personality of both God and man was lost in this evolution of all things from the Absolute. The universe was identified with a self-developing series of concepts emanating one from another by an inward necessity. Religion was defined as the consciousness of the finite being of its identity with the infinite. Strange to say, Hegel claimed that his system was in accord with the Christian faith. Christianity, it was said, expressed, in a popular style, the truth, which he had set forth in the pure and exact form of science. By this pretension, in which the founder of the system was not insincere, some Christian theologians were beguiled into an approval of the new philosophy. The hope was indulged that Christianity had now, at last, received a full and final vindication. This pleasing hope was soon dispelled by the fruits in the domain of theology which were borne upon this promising tree.

David Frederic Strauss, in 1835, published his "Life of Jesus," which was built up on Hegelian principles. It created a commotion throughout Germany, not to speak of its effect in other Christian countries. Strauss brought forward the mythical theory for explaining the origin of the narratives of miracles in the New Testament. This theory had been adopted under the auspices of Niebuhr, in reference to early Roman history. It had been applied by some to a portion of the Old Testament records. The stories of miracles related by the Evangelists were said by Strauss to be the product of unconscious invention in circles of early Galilean converts, cut off from the direct influence of the apostles. Such disciples imagined a series of events corresponding to Old Testament prophecies of the Messiah, and in imitation of like occurrences in the biblical accounts given of the ancient prophets. Strauss had to assume the existence of bodies of disciples thus removed from apostolic guidance, and at leisure to

The Pantheistic philosophy.

STRAUSS,
1808-1874.

brood over the life of Jesus and the Old Testament predictions. He did not attempt to show, what his theory necessarily implies—that the first preaching of Christianity and the four Gospels emanated, not from the apostles and their pupils, but from this secluded class, whose existence, moreover, is a pure fancy. But he did make the attempt to invalidate the testimony of the Evangelists, by convicting them of numberless discrepancies and errors. His method, however effective against a certain style of artificial harmonizing, was that of a sophistical advocate, and would, if followed in historical researches, destroy the trustworthiness of the testimony on which secular history—acknowledged by everybody as authentic—depends for credence.

Strauss was an adept in the literary art. Still, his work failed to give satisfaction, even to his master, Ferdinand Christian Baur The Tübingen school. (1792–1860), professor at Tübingen, and the founder of the Tübingen school of historical criticism. Baur was affected to his hurt by the Hegelian bias, but he was a man of large resources of learning, of indefatigable industry, and of high constructive talent. To him Christianity was a natural growth, but he saw the necessity of definite and consistent views respecting the documentary evidence—that is, the New Testament writings, and a clear notion of the steps of progress through which, in the formative period, Christianity passed. All this was missing in Strauss's book. Baur started with the assumption of an absolute conflict between the two Apostles, Paul and Peter, and between their respective adherents. He built much on the first Gospel, on the Apocalypse, and on the four principal epistles of Paul, the only New Testament Books which he conceded to be genuine. Most of the New Testament writings were considered by him to be written for a doctrinal purpose, either to reconcile the antagonistic parties, or as representing different stages in the development of Christian belief and speculation. Most of them he pronounced to be post-apostolic. The primitive gospel was Ebionitic; it went through a series of modifications, according to the principle of the Hegelian logic—where “thesis” and “antithesis” are followed by “synthesis,” or a higher unity—until we arrive at Nicene orthodoxy. But even Baur ventured not to offer any explanation of the faith of the apostles in the resurrection of Jesus, or of the conversion of Paul on the road to Damascus, which he does not hesitate to call a miracle (*Wunder*). On the list of the advocates of the Tübingen critical theories, who were taught by Baur, are the names of Zeller—who is better known in later times as a philosopher—Hilgen-

reld, and Volkmar. In a popular "Life of Jesus," Strauss subsequently endeavored to rescue himself by reversing his definition of a myth, bringing into it an element of conscious invention. In this production he turned with favor to a philosophy verging on materialism.

The earlier work of Strauss called out numerous answers. One may be named, as being of extraordinary merit. It was the "Life of Jesus" by Neander, a historian who could distinguish living Christianity from traditional accretions, was fettered by no bondage to the letter, but held firmly to the cardinal facts, including the miracles, and the essential doctrines, of the gospel. The same spirit which pervades this biography of the Lord he carried into the composition of other works, of which his "General History of the Church" is the most important. These volumes, together with the learned and accurate work of Gieseler on the same subject, are the most valuable productions in a department to which the Germans of late have richly contributed. The questions raised by Baur and his pupils have led to a long-continued and fruitful discussion.

Very active in the combat with the modern phases of unbelief were that class of German theologians who are ranked with the Liberal Evangelical school. Most of them received a strong influence from Schleiermacher; yet they have deviated from his opinions, sometimes very widely, and generally in a conservative direction. To many he served as a bridge over which to pass from a region of barren negations to beliefs more accordant with the general faith of the Church than he himself cherished. Rejecting the traditional formulas of inspiration, they have still adhered to the Protestant principle that the Scriptures are the rule of faith. They were friends of the Union established in 1817 by the Prussian Government, and by some of the other German governments, between the Lutherans and Calvinists. They generally took their stand on the consensus of the two confessions, the essentials of belief which were common to both branches of the Protestant family. To this school, with many differences among themselves, belong Nitzsch, Twisten, Julius Müller, Rothe, Dorner—names eminent in connection with the branches of dogmatic theology and ethics; the historians Neander and Hagenbach; the exegetical scholars Lücke, Tholuck, Bleek. The New Testament scholar, Meyer, was less in sympathy with Schleiermacher, and more wedded to Lutheran theology, but, in his views of the Scriptures and his principles of criticism,

Replies to
Strauss.

The Liberal
Evangelical
school.

was of the same school. De Wette and Hupfeld, critics and exegetical scholars, went further in the direction of opinions considered rationalistic; as did Ewald, a writer allied to no party, whose "History of the Old Testament People" is a monument of real genius, of profound scholarship, and of sincere piety, but is seriously marred by intolerant and sometimes eccentric judgments. An independent position was held by Hase, a writer in Church history of masterly ability and sound learning. Among the theologians who were averse to the union of the two confessions, there were those who adhered, with different degrees of strictness, to the Lutheran creed, and a less number who professed their continued adhesion to the Calvinistic system.

The fertility of the German mind, is illustrated in the recent appearance of a new school of theological opinion, which owes its origin to Albert Ritschl. In his youth, Ritschl was attached to the school of Baur, but this he early abandoned, and traversed its main points in a meritorious work on the origin of Christianity, "The Old Catholic Church." More recently, in an elaborate work on Justification, he has propounded views of doctrine, which have given rise to much controversy. The term "just" or "righteous," as he thinks, is used by Paul, not in the classical or judicial sense, but in the broader, Old Testament signification of the words, in which an element of benevolence is included. The "righteousness" of God denotes his consistent purpose and procedure in the work of saving his people. Christ, who is fully conscious of the eternal purpose of love, carries out that purpose in founding, and conducting to its goal, the kingdom of the redeemed. His death has no penal character, but in it is perfected and evinced his absolute fidelity to his divine calling. The forgiven sinner, by entering into the kingdom of Christ's followers, becomes a partaker of his filial relation to the Father. Christ is pronounced to be divine and an object of worship, yet preexistent only in the redeeming purpose of God. By the opponents of Ritschl—Luthardt and others—his doctrine is deemed inconsistent with the true and proper divinity of Jesus, as well as with orthodox ideas of the atonement.

Among the foremost expositors of Calvinism in Great Britain, in the present century, is the Baptist theologian, Andrew Fuller (1754–1815), who, in this department, holds among the

Fuller.

Baptists, a place as high as that of Robert Hall as a preacher, and that of John Foster (1770–1843) as an author of profound essays—the essay on "Decision of Character" being one

of the best. In Scotland, Chalmers, in his lectures on theology, like Fuller, shows the influence of Jonathan Edwards on his conceptions of doctrine. Since Chalmers, William Cunningham (1805-1861), and Robert S. Candlish (1806-1873), not to speak of other teachers and authors among the living, have written important works on systematic theology. In the Methodist denomination, no work has hitherto been produced more thorough and elaborate than the "Institutes of Theology" by Richard Watson (1781-1833).

In English theology, a distinctive and permanent influence emanated from Coleridge, justly characterized by De Quincey as a man of "most spacious intellect." Unfortunately, he lacked an energy of will proportioned to his intellectual gifts. He was at once a true poet and a philosopher of rare insight. Versed in the systems of Kant, Jacobi, and Schelling, he did not hesitate to draw from these German sources whatever was congenial with his own meditations. Over barren places in English theology he poured a fertilizing stream of original thought. His ideas and opinions are scattered in fragmentary form through his numerous writings. As regards theology, they make, in the "Aids to Reflection," the nearest approach to the character of a system. Coleridge insisted on the distinction between *nature* and *spirit*. Nature is a realm where the law of cause and effect reigns. In the domain of spirit, there is self-determination and self-consciousness. Another cardinal point is the distinction between *reason* and *understanding*. Reason is the faculty of intuitions with regard to things above sense. Reason is the "mind's eye," through which realities above sense are immediately discerned. The existence of God is presupposed in the human conscience: hence, it is our duty to believe in him. The proofs of Christianity are internal and moral. Coleridge has little sympathy with the school of Paley, in which miracles are the main ground of Christian belief. Faith in Christ precedes a doctrine respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures, a subject on which Coleridge advanced new views, to be noticed hereafter. He opposes the Arminian theory of original sin, and assumes a timeless choice of evil by the individual, as the basis of conscious character and actions. The different theories of the atonement are traced respectively to figurative representations, in Scripture, each of these theories choosing one of the figures—ransom, satisfaction of a debt, etc.—for its groundwork. The reality of the atonement is a mysterious act or work of Christ, the *effect* of which is regenera-

Chalmers.
Watson.
Samuel Taylor Coleridge,
1772-1834.

tion, having for its consequence deliverance from sin and its penal results.

No movement in English theology in the present century equals in importance the rise of the Tractarian school at Oxford, or of the party commonly designated as Puseyites. It drew support from that newly-awakened sympathy with the life of the middle ages, which the romances of Scott expressed and fostered. Its founders were John Henry Newman, John Keble, and a few other fellows of Oriel College. It acquired a distinct being about the year 1830. Keble, the poet of the school, published "The Christian Year" in 1827. In 1833, Newman and Keble were joined by Edward Bouverie Pusey. His high academic, as well as social position, caused his name to be attached to the party. The life and soul of the movement was Newman, a man of astonishing subtlety of genius, and in style one of the most captivating authors of his time. When Pusey became the leader, Newman and his associates had begun the publication of the "Tracts for the Times," in which their doctrines and aims were set forth in a way to attract in England universal attention. Puseyism was a protest against the growing liberalism which appeared, politically, in the measures leading to the Reform Bill, and theologically, in the spread of latitudinarian opinions. It was a protest against the Erastian principle whereby the Church was governed by the State. It was a revival of the Anglo-Catholic system, which involved not only an emphatic assertion of apostolic succession, but also high ideas of sacramental grace in general, and a view of the Real Presence, which was denied to be transubstantiation, although Pusey said later that it was "probably a dispute about words." A middle way—a *via media*—was sought between the Church of Rome and the Protestant bodies. Pusey, who was Canon of Christ Church, was suspended from preaching, in 1843, on account of a sermon delivered by him on the Eucharist. This circumstance increased his celebrity. Pusey vindicated tradition as a source of doctrine, and held to the authoritative character of doctrinal decisions made by councils prior to the division of the Eastern and Western Churches. To bring to pass a union of the prelatial bodies—the Churches of Rome, of the East, and of England—was a cherished aim of his party. Newman, not able to satisfy himself with a position midway between Luther and Rome—even under the Romanizing construction for which, in tract number 90, he tried to find room even in the Thirty-nine Articles—entered the Roman communion. His own account of the progress of his men-

The Oxford
Tractarian
school.

tal history is presented in the religious autobiography, the "Apologia pro Vita sua." There were not a few other converts from the Tractarian school to the Papal Church. Among them was Faber, an eloquent preacher and gifted hymn-writer, and Manning, afterward archbishop and cardinal. The Oxford school, whatever faults belonged to it, infused a new life into the services of the Established Church, revived a purer taste in church architecture, and promoted the study of Church history.

The Puseyites proved the most active branch of the High Church party. Another and older division clung to apostolical succession and the transmission of grace in the Episcopal order, but set a higher value on the Establishment, and did not sympathize with other peculiarities of the Oxford school. The Ritualists sought to modify the ceremonies of worship in order to set them in accord with the doctrine of the Real Presence, and cognate dogmatic views of the Tractarian party. In these approaches to the ritual of the Church of Rome Pusey felt no interest, but he was ready to defend the clergymen who, on account of them, were prosecuted in the courts of law. He remained a steadfast adversary of liberalism and rationalism in theology. In the "Essays and Reviews" was published a collection of papers by Anglican clergymen, in some of which rationalistic opinions of an advanced type were advocated. Pusey was active in the effort to convict the authors of heresy. The verdict of the legal tribunal, which decided that a clergyman of the English Church was not required by the Articles to believe and teach the doctrine of endless punishment, had the effect to weaken still more the attachment of the Puseyite party to the union of Church and State.

The Broad Church party has naturally comprised in it many varieties of temperament and opinion. It might be considered a continuance or revival of the Latitudinarian school of the seventeenth century. A desire to make the Established Church as comprehensive as possible, and to make it really the Church of the nation, has been accompanied by a greater or less departure from the dogmatic views usually entertained. The Broad Church party, in several of its modern phases, may be traced back to the influence of Coleridge. The idea of comprehension and the denial of the tenet of apostolic succession were prominent in the writings of a class of divines who have been termed the Earlier Oriel school, in distinction from the Tractarians, several of whom were attached to the same

Branches of
the High
Church party.

The Broad
Church party.

The Earlier
Oriel school.

college, but rose to influence a little later. Of this earlier school, Richard Whateley (1787-1863), afterwards Archbishop of Dublin and Thomas Arnold (1795-1842), who became the master of Rugby School, were distinguished leaders. The position relative to the Church and the function of prelates in Whateley's book on "The Kingdom of Christ" is the antipode of that taken by the Oxford School. Arnold was an advocate of Hooker's theory of the identity of Church and State. As a biblical critic and interpreter, he used a freedom not consistent with the traditional formulas of inspiration, which he did not accept. Arnold and Whateley contended strenuously against all the distinctive Puseyite doctrines. Neither of them would shut the door against innovations in theology; but they were not inclined to religious speculation or to mystical thought. In this they differed widely from Frederick Denison Maurice (1805-1872), the author of "The Kingdom of Christ," "Theological Essays," not to speak of many other works from his pen on themes of religion and philosophy. Maurice exerted a powerful influence

in diffusing a more spiritual type of Broad Church theology. Milman, Dean of St. Paul's, the most eminent of recent English authors in ecclesiastical history; Archdeacon Julius Hare, who wrote the "Mission of the Comforter;" Charles Kingsley, preacher, poet, and novelist; F. W. Robertson, whose sermons are among the ablest and most original products of the modern pulpit; Thirlwall, a bishop of solid learning and robust intelligence; Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster, who infused into his "History of the Jewish Church," and his other writings, a literary charm not often equalled, were classified with the Broad Church in the Anglican body. Beyond the pale of this body, Thomas Erskine, of Linlathen (1788-1870), by his books, and still more by his conversation, was effective in promoting kindred tendencies in theological belief.

In the closing years of the last, and in the first quarter of the present century, the Low Church, or "Evangelical" portion of this Anglican body, rapidly increased in numbers and influence. They made little account of apostolic succession, and had little to say of sacramental grace. Their activity was rather in the sphere of practical religion than of theological science. We have already referred to the most prominent leaders of the school. Among their preachers, besides Romaine and Newton, were Robert Cecil, and Thomas Scott, author of a once famous Commentary. Among the laymen connected with them, as we have seen, were William Wilberforce and the poet Cowper. After the

The later
Broad Church
party.

The Low
Church party.

rise of the Tractarian and Broad Church parties, their influence, although still strong, was relatively diminished.

We have now to glance at more recent discussions in philosophy and theology. The most eminent teacher of the Scottish

The Scottish philosophy. philosophy, and the most learned of that school, was Sir

William Hamilton (1788-1856). He maintained Reid's doctrine of an immediate, face-to-face perception of the external object. He held that we cannot conceive, in the proper sense, of the infinite—that the range of our power of conception lies between two extremes, one of which, however, must be real. We cannot conceive of free-will, which would involve an absolute beginning, nor can we conceive of the opposite, which would involve an infinite series of causes. We are bound to believe in free-will by the dictates of our moral nature. On the same foundation, the demand of our moral nature, our faith in God, reposes. On the basis of this philosophy, Mansel (1820-1871), in his "Limits of Religious Thought," endeavored to show that neither dogmatic theology nor rationalism has any solid ground to rest upon, since all our apprehensions of God and of his attributes are relative, are such only as finite creatures are capable of, who cannot know him as he is in himself. The philosophy of Hume was reproduced by John Stuart

J. S. Mill,
1806-1873.

Mill, who accounts for intuitions by tracing them back to impressions which are derived from an experience that

begins in infancy, and are so frequently conjoined as to seem native to the mind. Causation he made to be another name for the invariable association of phenomena, by which an expectation as to their recurrence is created that is delusively thought to be instinctive. In his later writings Mill was disposed to believe in a form of theism, and to find considerations favorable to the doctrine of a future life. In connection with the theory of evolution, which, as pro-

System of Herbert Spencer.

pounded by Darwin, was spreading among Naturalists, Herbert Spencer constructed a general system of philosophy. He availed himself of the doctrine of Hamilton and Mansel, that our knowledge is relative. Of things in themselves, he affirmed, we know nothing. Behind and below all phenomena is an inscrutable something, of which we have a vague consciousness, and which is termed the Unknowable. Yet *power* is ascribed to this infinite something. But power, in itself considered, we cannot know. The inference is that theology is a fiction. If the premises are accepted, a like inference, it is plain, should be drawn in relation to physical and natural science. Spencer's system involves a large profession of humility as to the capacity of the human

mind. It is an unsuccessful attempt to combine Positivism and Pantheism in a consistent system. Spencer's theory as to the origin of religion is, that it begins in the worship of ancestors. But how does this primitive worship arise? There must be a belief that the dead survive; and this belief is acquired by dreams in which they are presented as alive, and by maladies like insanity, in which ghosts seem to come and go. The religions of the world are referred to these and like delusions of savage progenitors.

In France, the sensualistic and materialistic school was victoriously assailed by a school of philosophy, spiritual and eclectic in its character, of which Royer-Collard (1763-1845) was the founder. He was a disciple of Reid. The work that he began was carried forward by Victor Cousin (1792-1867) and his followers, of whom Jouffroy (1796-1842) was the ablest. Later, under the auspices of Auguste Comte (1798-1857) the grounds of theism were once more attacked. From him sprang the Positivist school. He taught that we know only phenomena, or things as manifested to our consciousness. Of efficient or final causes we have no knowledge. There is no proof of their existence. There are three stages of thought, the mythological, which is due to the personifying imagination; the metaphysical, which resolves divine persons into substances and causes; and the positivist, which lands in confessed ignorance of aught save facts, to be arranged according to their degree of likeness or unlikeness, and in chronological order. In his old age, having by his theory abolished religion, Comte sought to bring it back in the form of a sentimental worship of humanity, of which woman, and the Virgin Mary in particular, is the symbol.

In Germany, among the doctrines propounded in the anarchy which followed the disintegration of the Hegelian school, Pessimism deserves to be mentioned. This is the philosophy of Schopenhauer and Von Hartmann. Its purport is that the world is radically and essentially evil, and personal existence is a curse from which the only refuge is the hope of annihilation. Theism has found able defenders and expositors in such philosophers as Ulrici, Trendelenburg, and Lotze. The last-named author, in his "Microcosm," and in other treatises, has shown that the belief in a God with personal and moral attributes is required by the facts respecting the constitution of nature as well as of man, which modern science has brought to light.

The religious doubts and difficulties which have sprung up in

connection with the discoveries and speculations of physical science, and through the assaults of Pantheism and Positivism, have given great prominence to Apologetic theology. This is seen in the numerous defences of theism which have appeared in recent years. It is manifest, also, in the wide-spread investigation of the origin and authority of the Scriptures, and of the view to be taken of their inspiration. During the last century, since the rise of geology, inquiries, which began with the first appearance of the Copernican theory, respecting the relation of biblical teaching to natural science, have excited much interest. The critical examination of the Scriptures, apart from this particular question, and the scrutiny applied to the history of the beginnings and early days of Christianity, have led to a great deal of controversy and to the publication of numberless treatises and essays. The recognition of the gradually developing character of Divine revelation has served to remove many sources of perplexity in the biblical books, especially those of the Old Testament. The books of the Pentateuch and the documents which have been supposed to enter into their structure, and the relative antiquity of different portions of the Old Testament legal and ceremonial system, have long been, and still are, themes of scholarly inquiry and animated debate. Since the rise of the Tübingen school, doubts as to the genuineness of the fourth Gospel, and arguments on the negative side, have given rise to numerous works in vindication of the Johannine authorship.

Modern biblical study has affected the views taken of the inspiration of the sacred writers. While the former opinions on this subject have still extensively prevailed, their correctness has been called in question, not only by assailants of revelation, but also by numerous scholars and writers within the pale of the evangelical churches. These have maintained the necessity of so far modifying accepted formulas as to make room for the concession of historical discrepancies in the sacred books, and even for occasional imperfections in modes of reasoning and in the interpretation of Old Testament passages by New Testament authors. Theologians have called attention to the distinction between revelation and inspiration. One of the writers who has discussed the subject of inspiration from a new point of view is Cole-
Inspiration of the Bible. ridge. He denies the infallibility of the Bible in all its parts, both in matters of fact and of doctrine. He brings forward the suggestion that the spirit of the Book, as a whole, is to sit in judgment on each separate portion. On this principle, the Bible, as *

whole, is still the rule of faith. Rothe, the eminent German theologian, in like manner finds in the Scriptures a self-rectifying, as well as self-explaining character, so that whatever criticism may justly be made on a particular item of teaching is authorized by the Bible itself and the collective impression which the Bible makes. Rothe also distinguishes between the doctrines taught by the apostles, and the arguments which they use in support of them. He holds that while the doctrines may be revealed to them, and may lie within the range of the intuition of faith, the reasoning in defence of them, including the appeals to Old Testament passages, may not be wholly free from imperfections, due to limited knowledge and peculiarities of education. Dorner is one of a school of theologians who call in the aid of "the Christian consciousness" as a judge as well as interpreter of the sacred volume. One form of this doctrine is that the experience, or the state of mind and heart, which the gospel, in its central and essential elements, evokes in the believer, may serve, to some extent, as a test of the truth or value of collateral or subordinate particulars of biblical teaching. A mode of thought, now prevalent, has been thus described lately by a Scottish theological leader, orthodox in his beliefs, Dr. Robert Rainy :—

"It has to do with the method or habit of carrying on the interpretation of Scripture. But especially it is concerned with the conditions under which the process of drawing forth Scripture teaching into doctrinal conclusions such as the Christian and the Church may count to be articles of faith. This is not to be gone about quite so simply or directly as it was wont to be. It seems that more elaborate pains are needed to make sure of the main intention of the inspired writer, and to weigh the relation in which his various utterances stand to that main intention. Moreover, effort is needed to conceive precisely what the writer was conscious of, as revealed truth infused into the total of his knowledge and impression, and what he holds forth to us in this character. And then we must estimate what this signifies or imports to us, when it is to become part of that total of knowledge or impression which, as yet, we have attained from nature or from Scripture. It is a hesitation lest we should too easily trust to surface impressions, and impute an effect to free and fervent speech which is more or other than was intended, and should too hastily appropriate phrases which take a different sense in our minds from that which they had in an apostle's. It comes very much to this, that an old rule of interpretation is imagined to have a wider range of application than used to be perceived. Probably this is a wholesome tendency, or will eventually prove to be so, in so far as it imposes the most needful care that the inspired teaching shall be apprehended in its designed proportion and emphasis, and shall reveal its proportion and emphasis to denizens of other lands and other ages. So far it is wholesome. Perhaps, on the other hand, it works in company with a somewhat exaggerated impression as to the degree in which any such

fresh precautions can finally modify the conclusions which Scripture warrants, and which the Church has drawn. But meanwhile, at any rate, this operation, like others that are going on, is in progress."

In Scotland and in the United States, the doctrine of the federal headship of Adam and of the imputation of sin on the ground of a covenant, has continued to prevail among large bodies of Calvinists. The Arminian conception of original sin has remained, not only among the Methodists but among many belonging to other Christian bodies; while the New England view of an inherited proclivity to sin, coupled with a "natural ability," never exercised by the unconverted, to avoid it, has retained its hold on numerous adherents. Meantime, other solutions of the perplexing problem of the origin and dissemination of moral evil have been broached. Julius Müller, in a work of masterly ability, on the doctrine of sin, has advocated the hypothesis of a timeless pre-existence and fall of the individuals of the race—the supposition of Origen. This theory was maintained, as was remarked above, by Coleridge. The doctrine of a fall of the individuals of the race in a pre-existent state has been defended in "The Conflict of Ages," a vigorous treatise from the pen of an American writer, Dr. Edward Beecher.

The concentration of attention upon the life, the person, and the work of Christ, is characteristic of the recent theology. The issue, in different countries, of so many biographies of Jesus, indicates the profound interest that is felt in the subject. This interest extends beyond the simple curiosity to ascertain what occurred in connection with his earthly career. It embraces an ardent desire to penetrate, so to speak, within his consciousness, and to obtain a practical and satisfactory conception of the ongoing of his mental and spiritual life. Where the ancient creeds which assert his divinity and his humanity are still accepted, there is often manifest an earnest wish to arrive at some clearer view of the import and effect of the Incarnation. Among the hypotheses which have been suggested and supported to meet this inquiry, two in particular merit attention. One is the theory of "the Kenosis"—that is, the theory that, during the life of Jesus, prior to his ascension and glorification, he was not in the full exercise of Divine attributes, as omnipotence and omniscience. The incarnation involved, it is said, the temporary laying aside of these infinite powers, as far as their full activity is concerned, a "depotentialiation" of the divine Word, or Logos. The

The doctrine
of sin.

Müller,
1801-1878.

The life of
Jesus.

The Incarna-
tion.

other theory is that of a gradual union of the divine and human natures, a union, real, to be sure, at the beginning, but producing its effects in the consciousness of Jesus by degrees, through a process that keeps pace with the unfolding of his human powers and the development of his spotless character to a mature perfection. In this way, it is proposed to account for the limitations of his knowledge and power during his sojourn among men. The former of the two hypotheses counts among its advocates Julius Müller; the latter is upheld by Dörner.

The judicial view of the Atonement, founded on Anselmic ideas, and the governmental view, as expounded by Grotius and the younger Edwards, have each of them continued to com-

The Atonement.

mand the assent of large bodies of Christians. But a

deep interest has been awakened, during the recent period, in the moral and spiritual elements which give to the atoning work of Christ its efficacy, and in the effort to ascertain the inmost source of the Saviour's sufferings, especially in the garden and on the cross. Another characteristic of the more recent theology is the tendency to regard the atonement as the natural fruit of the incarnation, instead of disjoining the one from the other, and considering the incarnation as simply a condition and means of giving to the atoning death an adequate value. The "moral view" of the atonement, which either takes away its expiatory relation or makes it more incidental and subordinate, has had of late, in the different Protestant countries, a considerable number of advocates.

In the United States, it was presented in a treatise on "Vicarious Sacrifice," by Horace Bushnell, a preacher remarkable for his genius and for his elevated Christian feeling, mingled with a bold speculative turn of mind. He had previously presented, in his "God in Christ" and "Christ in Theology," a view of the person of Christ and of the Trinity which was not easy to be distinguished from the Sabellian or Patripassianist conception. In the treatise referred to above, the atonement was resolved into the impression of God's abhorrence of sin, which is incidentally made by the sufferings and death of Christ, endured while on the merciful errand of bringing men to repentance and to the Father's house. In a later publication, "Forgiveness and Law," he modified his view, representing that the suffering to which God in Christ freely submitted was the indispensable means of realizing in himself that feeling of clemency which was obstructed in its outflow by his sense of wrong and his holy displeasure.

Bushnell,
1802-1876.

A Scottish theologian, J. McLeod Campbell, in a suggestive

and devout volume on the atonement, makes its main element to be a repentance on the part of Christ—the element of self-blame being, of course, absent—for the sins of mankind. He realized in consciousness the full depth of human guilt, and the feeling of condemnation in the mind of God, and out of a heart thus complete in its sympathy with the holiness as well as mercy of God, and with the guilty and forlorn condition of men, he prayed for their forgiveness. The means by which Christ attained to this consciousness was the experience of suffering—the experience of death, which is “the wages of sin.” He is thus and then enabled to respond with an “amen” to the Divine condemnation of sin. Faith is the “amen” of the sinful human soul to this response of Jesus. The sonship which he has realized in himself he imparts to believers.

Of a kindred character is the exposition of the subject by Rothe. God is disposed to forgive sin, but is prevented by his holiness from doing what would lend to sin encouragement. He can forgive, however, and his holiness, which hates sin and desires it to cease, prompts him to forgive, provided the act of forgiveness can be made the beginning, as it plainly is, and an indispensable pre-requisite, of a new life of obedience and love. Christ makes sin forgivable by providing this basis for pardon. He makes himself the instrument of the world's regeneration, by himself attaining to spiritual perfection through victory over temptation—victory at the cost of life. On this path he ascends to the glorified state, in which, through the Holy Spirit, he can act on the hearts of sinful men, and create in all who give themselves up to him, to be moulded in his image, a participation in sonship, and in the heavenly purity and blessedness which follow in its train.

On the subject of eschatology, it is safe to say that in the recent period a spiritual conception of the mode of the resurrection has rapidly gained ground in opposition to the idea of a reconstruction from its ruins of the material body which is deposited in the grave. The more common belief in later times has been that Christianity will continue to spread until mankind are subdued to Christ, and society has become thoroughly leavened with his spirit, and that his visible coming will then take place. Not a few Protestant Christians, however, have held to a pre-millennial advent of the Lord, and have looked for no such triumph of the gospel prior to that event. From time to time, parties have arisen by whom the speedy advent of Christ has been confi-

Campbell,
1800-1872.

Richard
Rothe,
1799-1867.

The resurrec-
tion; the sec-
ond coming
of Christ.

dently predicted. Enthusiasts have occasionally set particular days when this consummation was expected to occur.

Within evangelical bodies, modifications of belief on the subject of the future state of the wicked have won more or less acceptance. In England, the doctrine that future punishment is endless was rejected by the eminent Baptist author, John Foster, and, on similar grounds, by an honored Congregational minister, Thomas Binney (1798–1874). It was called in question by F. D. Maurice and some other divines of the Anglican Church. In Germany, in Great

Britain, and in the United States, the doctrine of the Eschatology. ultimate extinction of the very being of such as persevere in impenitence, as the natural effect of sin on the spiritual nature, has had its adherents. In Germany, one of its advocates was the celebrated theologian, Richard Rothe. The explicit hope of a final restoration to holiness of all who depart from this life in a state of impenitence has been cherished by some. Neander and some other leading German theologians of the liberal evangelical school have expressed themselves as doubtful on this point. Julius Müller held that the arguments for such a belief—which was adopted by Schleiermacher—are insufficient. He points out the frequent connection in which restorationism is made to stand with a pantheistic theory of the necessary evolution of good out of evil. Dorner denies that such a consummation can be an object of confident expectation. Especially among German theologians of this school, the opinion has come to prevail that in an intermediate state the gospel will be taught to the heathen who have not heard it within the bounds of this life, and have, therefore, never rejected its offers of mercy. This was the belief of Müller, Tholuck, a distinguished teacher of theology and commentator, and of other German teachers and writers. By Müller it is set forth in conjunction with a doctrine respecting the nature and development of character in general, and of sinful character in particular. Character is built up by the exercise of free-will, and tends to permanence. As character, under the influence of the motives that address the soul, moves onward to the final stage, it meets with turning-points where a radical change may take place; but a reversal of its bent becomes less and less practicable. At last obduracy cuts off hope. This hopeless bondage to evil follows upon the wilful rejection of God's redeeming love. The one unpardonable sin is that of resistance to the Holy Spirit. No other or higher agency exists for the recovery of the will from its slavery. Dorner, in his "System of Theology," has expounded this conception.

He holds distinctly that the final test, where the alternative of right choice is obduracy, is possible only when the gospel is explicitly revealed, and God is manifested in the light of a merciful Saviour. That there will be a "probation" in the next world for the heathen who die without a knowledge of the gospel, has been suggested as a plausible hypothesis, or as a probable truth, by a number of theological writers in England and America. This view has been recently propounded in the United States, by theologians of Andover, in a series of discussions, collected in a volume entitled "Progressive Orthodoxy" (1886).

CHAPTER IX.

CHRISTIAN PIETY AND CHRISTIAN PHILANTHROPY.

THE preceding record of religious movements in later times has involved some account of different phases of piety and religious life. A very systematic treatment of a theme so complex is hardly practicable within the limits of this chapter.

The last two centuries have been a period of revolution. Political revolutions have swept away mediæval institutions in Europe, and in America formed a great federative democracy out of a group of colonial provinces. There has been a revolution in the world of letters, in education, science, and philosophy. Marvellous inventions have brought all the inhabitants of the globe near together. Christianity has been called upon to adapt itself to this new order of things, to fulfil its heaven-appointed mission under altered circumstances.

Literature has ceased to be the product of the ecclesiastical spirit. It has asserted its freedom. It has drawn its materials from the soul within and from nature without, from ancient art and letters, from human history in its broadest extent. It is not of necessity, for this reason, alien to the spirit and conceptions of the gospel; for even as related to the activities and products of the intellect, the kingdom of God "is like unto leaven." All depends on whether Christian views of the universe and of man, and Christian ideals of character, elicit sympathy or antipathy. Poetry—to single out one department of literature—takes its tone from the political and social struggles of the time, or else from the reigning philosophy. Shelley, with his sensitive nature, at a time of popular uprising against tyranny, was prepared to imbibe from French writers denials of received doc-

trines in religion, and to carry his wild crusade against convention alism to the extreme of discarding obligations hallowed by divine and human law. Yet Christian elements are to be recognized in Shelley's early passion for the brotherhood of man, and in his grief and anger at brutal oppression, first brought home to his perception through voices heard from a school-room—voices that

“ Were but one echo from a world of woes—
The harsh and grating strife of tyrants and of foes.”

The sentimentalism which found its egotistic, passionate expression in “*Manfred*” and other poems of Byron, and in Goethe's “*Sorrows of Werther*,” the production of his unripe youth, was at least a witness to the discontent of the soul with itself and to its hunger for an unattained good. In English poetry, the names of Cowper, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Tennyson, suggest the advance made above the plane of the classical school of the last century, the school of Dryden and Pope. In the later poets we find a sympathy with higher truth and with aspirations in accord with the gospel.

In Germany, Schiller, in his early career as a poet, was strongly influenced by the philosophy of Kant, which imparted at least a tone of moral earnestness to his productions. Goethe, on the contrary, found more to appeal to him in the pantheistic ideas of Schelling. As Goethe took pains to avoid the sight of pain and wretchedness, so he resolutely turned away from thoughts of sin and of the life to come, which might disturb the repose of his spirit. Yet this withdrawal of attention cost him at times an effort, as he himself distinctly implies. In “*Faust*,” his masterpiece, it is the insatiable quest of the soul for a fulness of peace, the shudder which moral evil in its malignity excites, the willing yet, for that reason, the more terrible surrender to the tempter, the pity of heaven—characteristic elements of gospel teaching—which move the reader or spectator of this wonderful tragedy. In insisting on the immanence of God in nature, as opposed to the conception of his touching it from without, “with his finger's end,” the poets, and Goethe among them, are justified by the New Testament. It is Christian, if it be not Jewish, theology. It is a Christian poet who speaks of the

“ Sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused,
A motion and a spirit that impels
All thinking things, all objects of all thought,
And rolls through all things.”

It is only when a personal will, a conscious intelligence, are denied to the Power whose energy pervades all things, that the Christian revelation is impugned. At the same time, under this blighting fatalism, human responsibility and trial, and the immortal life beyond—truths which underlie what is most lofty in works of the imagination—shrivel away. In poetry, as in science, it is not the idea of the immanence of God in the world, but the pantheistic ignoring or rejection of the complementary truth—the truth of the personality of both God and man—that clashes with the convictions of a Christian. But Goethe, influenced though he was, to such a degree, by the atmosphere of thought in which he grew up, was too great a man to think lightly of the Christian faith. In one of his last conversations with Eckermann, he said: “Let mental culture continually increase, let the natural sciences grow, broadening and deepening in their progress, and the human mind expand as it will,—beyond the elevation and moral culture of Christianity, as it gleams and shines forth in the gospels, men will never advance.” The “worship of genius,” under the notion that men of exalted powers are exempt from the restraints of morality, was a form of idolatry too baneful and debasing to gain a foothold where there was any life in conscience. And yet it followed naturally from the pantheistic mode of thought, in which blind power is deified and all its manifestations are regarded as equally divine.

In another great literary leader of the recent period, there is witnessed a wavering between the pantheistic and theistic position. It is Thomas Carlyle. The apostle of sincerity, his abhorrence of all falsehood implies at its root a theistic belief. A hero of faith, such as Luther, he knows how to appreciate. The godliness of Oliver Cromwell is to him something real and sacred. A passage in a letter of Carlyle, written in his last days, to his friend, Erskine of Linlathen, shows the faith that was slumbering within him, and which the experience of sorrow woke to a new life. It was written after the death of his wife :

“ ‘ Our Father which art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done ; ’ what else can we say ? The other night, in my sleepless tossings about, which were growing more and more miserable, these words, that brief and grand prayer, came strangely into my mind with an altogether new emphasis, as if written and shining for me in mild, pure splendor, on the black bosom of the night there ; where I, as it were, read them, word by word, with a sudden check to my imperfect wanderings, with a sudden softness of composure which was much unexpected. Not for perhaps thirty or forty years had I ever formally repeated that prayer—nay, I never felt be-

fore how intensely the voice of man's soul it is; the inmost aspiration of all that is high and pious in poor human nature; right worthy to be recommended with an 'after this manner, pray ye.'"

Profound convictions in relation to fundamental religious truth have been expressed by men who have stood aloof from existing church organizations, and have, perhaps, rejected the accepted dogmatic statements of Christianity. Lacordaire, the renowned French preacher, is said to have been awakened in his youth from the dreams of ambition by being struck with "the nothingness of irreligion." It is not strange that such a thought should have power even with many, who from various causes fail to attain to an assured faith in the doctrines of the Church. The abyss of irreligion is felt to be something dreadful to contemplate, whether the yearnings of the individual soul are considered, or the needs of society. The rise of Socialism, with the attendant conflict of labor and capital, and concerted efforts of the working class to effect revolutionary changes, have impressed thoughtful men with the dire evil that is involved in the loss of religious trust and hope. In the generations past, laborers, even when deprived of the comforts of life, the victims, perhaps, of oppressive social arrangements, have found consolation in looking up to God, and in looking forward to compensations in a future state. In the midst of drudgery, thoughts of religion have lifted them up and cheered them under heavy burdens. Cut off from these fountains of strength, they are left with no alternative but to grasp what they can in the fleeting moments of the present life. On this subject, a man of genius, Victor Hugo, thus speaks, in a passage which is translated in "The Contemporary Review:"

Social dis-
content.

Words of Vic-
tor Hugo.

"Let us not forget, and let us teach it to all, that there would be no dignity in life, that it would not be worth while to live, if annihilation were to be our lot. What is it which alleviates and which sanctifies toil, which renders men strong, wise, patient, just, at once humble and aspiring, but the perpetual vision of a better world, whose light shines through the darkness of the present life? For myself, I believe profoundly in that better world; and after many struggles, much study, and numberless trials, this is the supreme conviction of my reason as it is the supreme consolation of my soul."

"There is a misfortune of our times," he continues "I could almost say there is but *one* misfortune of our times; it is the tendency to stake all on the present life. By giving to man, as a sole end and object, the material life of this world, you aggravate its every misery by the negation which awaits him at the end; you add to the burdens of the unfortunate the insupportable weight of future nothingness; and that which was only suffering, that is to say, the law ordained of God, becomes despair, the law imposed by

hell. Hence our social convulsions. Assuredly I am one of those who desire, I will not say, with sincerity, for the word is too feeble, but who desire with inexpressible ardor, and by all means possible, to ameliorate the lot of all who suffer; but the first of all ameliorations is to give them hope. How greatly lessened are our finite sufferings when there shines in the midst of them an infinite hope! The duty of us all, whoever we may be—legislators and bishops, priests, authors, and journalists—is to spread abroad, to dispense and to lavish in every form, the social energy necessary to combat poverty and suffering, and at the same time to bid every face to be lifted up to heaven, to direct every soul and mind to a future life where justice shall be executed. We must declare with a loud voice that none shall have suffered uselessly, and that justice shall be rendered to all. Death itself shall be restitution. As the law of the material universe is equilibrium, so the law of the moral universe is equity. God will be found at the end of all."

That the discoveries of modern science have had the effect for the time, in the case of many, of unsettling their faith in Christian truth, is an undoubted fact. It requires reflection to perceive that the scientific spirit—the pursuit of an exact, methodized, exhaustive knowledge of the world in which we live, and of man, its inhabitant—stands in no contradiction to the spirit of religion. On the other hand, whatever exhilaration may spring from the enlargement of knowledge, it soon becomes clear that man cannot live by science alone, but that within him are capacities and cravings of another kind, with which the soul's true life and peace are inseparably linked. It is soon perceived that the essential relations of man to God are not determined by the size of the globe, compared with other planets, by its relation to the stellar universe, by its age, or by the time that may have elapsed since man's creation. The consciousness of man that there is an infinite God above him, and a moral law within him, is not affected by facts of this nature. Evolution is perceived to be a term descriptive simply of the supposed *method* of nature: of the creative and directive energy, by which the process begins and is carried forward it contains no explanation. New discoveries in natural science, however, as far as they require new interpretations of the Bible, or a modification of traditional ideas respecting the character and limits of inspiration, may give rise to doubts and perplexity. It may be here remarked that not professed Christian teachers alone, but the most authoritative expounders of the new doctrines in natural science, have pronounced them nowise at variance with the great argument of design. Among these authorities in science are found most earnest and sincere believers. One of them was Faraday, who belonged to the small sect of Sandemanians, who, in

Science and
scepticism.

the last century, separated from the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, but who hold to the fundamental truths of the gospel. Another was Clerk Maxwell, a physicist of the highest ability, who found nothing in the doctrine of the "conservation of force" to clash with the evidences of either natural or revealed religion.

In a period of transition, when old formulas are losing their hold and new statements of religious truth are not yet matured; when, also, the foundations of Christian belief are assailed by historical criticism or by philosophical speculation, it is inevitable that in many ingenuous minds faith should be mixed, more or less, with doubt. The bishop, in Browning's poem, exchanged

"A life of doubt diversified by faith,
For one of faith diversified by doubt."

Yet, under such circumstances, there are victories of faith, legitimately won, which illustrate forcibly the indestructible basis on which the claims of Christianity to the allegiance of the soul rest. Such examples in modern times have been not unfrequent in Germany. Some there are, with so deep a sense of religion, and to whom the gospel shines with so clear a light, that they are never harassed by skepticism. Rothe, with a genius for speculation, with a mind open to new truth, and familiar with the theories and arguments of the skeptical schools, nevertheless declares that he had felt no doubt of the being of God, and had never experienced any difficulty in giving credence to miracles. An interesting record of triumph over doubt, of a faith in Christian verities that grew in strength from year to year, is furnished in the biography of

Life of
Perthes,
1772-1843.

Frederick Perthes, the publisher of Gotha, who stood in so intimate relations with Niebuhr, Schleiermacher, Nitzsch, Neander, and many other distinguished men of the time. By him the "Studien und Kritiken," the most influential theological review in Germany, was founded. His motive was to do good. "I do not expect," he said, "any return." His point of view, in contrast with that of rationalism, is thus described: "Some believe that they can find sufficient support in their own souls, in those faculties which God, from the beginning, gave once for all to the human race. According to them, God completed the whole at the creation of the world, and each individual has now but to employ the faculties already given without further assistance from on high, being fully qualified to discover truth. Now, to seekers of this kind, that is to say, rationalists, we do not belong. Others,

on the contrary, believe that, in spite of the one great creative act, they still walk in darkness, and are lost so long as they are left to themselves; their first and greatest desire is that God should renew them day by day, but, apart from revelation and redemption, they see no escape from sin, no light in the night's darkness." Perthes, speaking in relation to the "Life of Jesus," by Strauss, discriminates between what can, and what cannot, be accomplished by historical proofs. "Historical science and criticism," he remarks, "can show only the groundlessness of objections against the sacred narrative."

"Whoever would make the saving truths of revelation his own, or lead others to them, must start from facts coming under his own immediate knowledge. The depravity of all mankind, sin, our double nature, wrestling, weakness, and death in every individual, and the ardent longing of the whole man for deliverance from such evils—these are facts, and they form a basis for faith in the salvation revealed by Scripture. To every one in whose soul God has established such a basis of faith, the life of Jesus and the apostles becomes the key and key-stone of the world's history, even scientifically regarded."

Yet Perthes believed in the most full and thorough discussion. "To stop half way," he says, "in scientific investigation would be fatal to theology and the theologian. It will not do to recede, or, declining inquiry, to hush all up in pious phrases; theology and the theologian must onward, at whatever cost." He said of himself, "I have striven and wrestled, but the world and the flesh have hindered me. Only for moments have I, in and through prayer, tasted of the peace of God." He was in the habit of turning for comfort to the Epistle to the Romans, and, at a later time, especially to the Gospel of John. "Pain and sorrow," he wrote, "have done more for me than joy and happiness ever did." When near his end, he wrote to Neander: "In hope and faith I am joyfully passing over into the land where truth will be made clear and love pure." To his family he said, "I die willingly and calmly, and I am prepared to die, having committed myself to my God and Father."

In the biography of Niebuhr, we have the portrait of a scholar and a statesman, a man at home in the past, yet engaging actively in the political transactions of his own time. Such was the moral earnestness of his character, that his deep interest in historical investigation did not dampen in the least the ardor of his patriotism. Brandis says of him that it was

not his nature "to observe and judge the occurrences of social life with the same coolness" as the necessary sequences of natural events. Like Dr. Thomas Arnold, noble deeds, whether in the remote past or in the present, kindled in him admiration, while base deeds, however long ago they were done, excited in him an intense indignation. His lot was cast in the midst of the stirring scenes when Germany was enslaved under Napoleon, and awoke to shake off the bondage. Of his inward religious history he says, in a letter written in 1812: "My intellect early took a skeptical direction." This disposition was increased by the lack of any strong spiritual need, and by poor instruction. "Thus," he adds, "it was in riper years, and through the study of history, that I came back for the first time to the sacred books, which I read in a purely critical spirit, and with the purpose of studying their contents as the groundwork of one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of the world. This was not the mood in which real faith could spring up." Nevertheless, defects in the biblical narratives did not disturb him. His sound historical judgment was not so easily misled.

"Here, as in every historical subject, when I contemplated the immeasurable gulf between the narrative and the facts narrated, this disturbed me no further. He, whose earthly life and sorrows were depicted, had for me a perfectly real existence, and his whole history had the same reality, even if it were not related with literal exactness in a single point."

"The fundamental fact of miracles" seemed to Niebuhr lifted above reasonable doubt. He saw the distinction between the character of the gospel miracles and all false legends. Metaphysical systems which clung to the Christian name, while they eviscerated the gospel of its supernatural contents, he repelled as a juggle—as a stone offered in the room of bread. "A Christianity," he said, "after the fashion of the modern philosophers and pantheists, without a personal God, without immortality, without human individuality, without historical faith, is no Christianity at all to me." He wanted no religion but that of the Apostles' Creed. His religion must be one whose doctrines and precepts were a divine revelation. He did not grieve over the want of "a *system* of religion." "The orthodox divines of the seventeenth century," he remarks, "subscribed to the symbolical books with a fulness of conviction which we cannot possess now, because they are a systematic body of doctrine, and the systems of one century are uncongenial with the mental habits of another." In the case of

Luther, "the faith that was in him" was "the material on which he labored." After him arose system-makers to whom "all profound feeling, all glowing devotion, was an abomination." Thus, in the midst of a generation infected with skepticism and torn with theological conflict, this great historical scholar and patriot discerned the immovable foundations of the Christian faith.

It will often happen that in times of spiritual declension, when a worship of system, a barren orthodoxy has been substituted for

Mystics. vital faith, mystics will arise to show practically that religion is something more than a dry dogma, an exercise

of the understanding. It may be that in such a protest of the heart, vagaries will be mingled, having no solid basis. Yet with much that is visionary there will be connected a real insight into things divine, and suggestions of high value to those who know how to sift out the chaff from the wheat. We have already had occasion to refer to the development of mysticism in the Roman Catholic Church, as it appeared in the writings of Molinos, Fénelon, and Madame Guyon. In Germany, in the writings of Arndt (1555-1621), and in the later pietism, the mystical spirit was seen, in strong contrast with the frigid schools of thought then preva-

Böhme,
1675-1624.

lent. But among modern German mystics, Jacob Böhme is one of the most interesting. His death occurred shortly before the limit set for the beginning of the modern period, but his influence extended into later times. A shoemaker at Görtitz, with a very limited supply of learning, at a time when an intolerant Lutheran dogmatism furnished little nutriment for a deeply religious nature like his own, he was cheered by the assurance of God's Word that he is willing to give his Holy Spirit to them that ask Him. In the illumination granted by the Spirit, he believed himself to discern directly the realities of faith, disclosed to the mind's eye. Vilified as an heretical dreamer by the Lutheran clergy about him, his sincere piety, as well as philosophic depth, have been recognized since by men as widely different from one another in their mental qualities as Law, Coleridge, and Hegel. Of his unaffected devotion he gave abundant proof. The circumstances of his death were characteristic. A few hours before it occurred—it was on a Sunday—he seemed to hear sweet music, and shortly before he expired, he bade good-by to his wife and children, saying: "Now I am going to Paradise."

If exalted religious emotion, blissful experiences of the reality of the heavenly world and of the objects of faith, are to be called mystical, then this term may be applied to many whose vigor and

clearness of intellect have never been questioned. The tone of Puritan piety was, in a certain sense, severe. The religious life of the Puritan was pervaded by conscientiousness. He demanded a reason for what he was to believe. He shunned extravagances of feeling and expression. Yet, in Jonathan Edwards, a typical Puritan of New England, we find an enthusiasm of devotion for a parallel to which we must resort to the lives of the holiest of mediæval saints. On a certain day, in his early youth, he "walked abroad" in his father's pasture. These are his own words :

"As I was walking there, and looking up in the sky and clouds, there came into my mind so sweet a sense of the glorious majesty and grace of God, that I knew not how to express. I seemed to see them both in a sweet conjunction ; majesty and meekness joined together ; it was a sweet and gentle and holy majesty, and also a majestic sweetness, an awful sweetness ; a high and great and holy gentleness.

"God's excellency, his wisdom, his purity and love seemed to appear in everything ; in the sun and moon and stars ; in the clouds and blue sky ; in the grass, flowers, trees ; in the water and all nature, which used greatly to fix my mind. I often used to sit and view the moon for a long time, and in the day spent much time in viewing the clouds and sky to behold the sweet glory of God in these things, in the meantime singing forth with a low voice my contemplations of the Creator and Redeemer."

"I spent most of my time," he says, "in thinking of divine things, year after year ; often walking alone in the woods, and solitary places, for meditation, soliloquy, and prayer, and converse with God ; and it was always my manner, at such times, to sing forth my contemplations." An incident, which occurred at a somewhat later time, is thus related by him :

"Once, as I rode out into the woods for my health, in 1737, having alighted from my horse in a retired place, as my manner commonly has been, to walk for divine contemplation and prayer, I had a view, that for me was extraordinary, of the glory of the Son of God, as Mediator between God and man, and his wonderful, great, full, pure, and sweet grace and love, and meek and gentle condescension. This grace that appeared so calm and sweet, appeared also great above the heavens. The person of Christ appeared ineffably excellent, with an excellency great enough to swallow up all thought and conception—which continued, as near as I can judge, about an hour ; which kept me the greater part of the time in tears, and weeping aloud. I felt an ardency of soul to be, what I know not otherwise how to express, emptied and annihilated ; to lie in the dust, and to be full of Christ alone ; to love him with a holy and pure love ; to trust in him ; to live upon him ; to serve and follow him ; and to be perfectly sanctified and made pure, with a divine and heavenly purity. I have, several other times, had experiences of very much of the same nature, and which have had the same effects."

Edwards is by no means the only Puritan in whom Calvinistic doctrine was united with ecstatic experiences. Samuel Hopkins, another saintly divine of New England, records intuitions and emotions which he experienced in his youth :

“As I was in my closet one evening, while I was meditating and in my devotions, a new and wonderful scene opened to my view. I had a sense of the being and presence of God as I never had before ; it being more of a reality, and more affecting and glorious than I had ever before perceived. And the character of Jesus Christ, the mediator, came into view, and appeared such a reality and so glorious, and the way of salvation by him so wise, important and desirable, that I was astonished at myself that I had never seen these things before, which were so plain, pleasing, and wonderful. I longed to have all see and know these things as they now appeared to me.”

Hopkins, when a student in Yale College, was led to begin a Christian life, partly by the influence of David Brainerd (1718-1747), who became a celebrated missionary to the Indians. The convert thus made became a leading theologian in New England, and was one of the earliest opponents of slavery and the slave-trade.

From the recent history of the Church may be drawn many illustrations of the power of an earnest inculcation of the truths of sin, and of reconciliation through Christ, to penetrate the heart, and to alter the bent of men's lives. Communities, either indifferent or hostile to preaching of this character, have been moved by it in a degree to occasion surprise. This is not true of the uncultivated class only. The like effect has been seen in academic societies. Where the teaching may be open to criticism, either as lacking a just insight into the relations of Christian truth to philosophy, or in that genial tone which is not inconsistent with plain and pointed speech, these defects have been neutralized by the force that inheres in the message of the gospel, if uttered with the accents of conviction. At the University of Cambridge, in England, Simeon, one of the chief founders of the Evangelical School in the English Church, had a career which strikingly confirms the foregoing statements. He lived to overcome the general aversion and contempt with which he was at first met. Bishop Wilson, of Calcutta, thus spoke of him, shortly after his death :

“Contrast the commencement and the close of his course. He stood for many years alone ; he was long opposed, ridiculed, shunned ; his doctrines were misrepresented ; his little peculiarities of voice and manner were satirized ; disturbances were frequently raised in his church ; he was a person not

taken into account, nor considered in the light of a regular clergyman of the Church. Such was the beginning of things. But mark the close. For the last portion of his ministry all was rapidly changing. He was invited repeatedly to take courses of sermons before the university. The same great principles that he preached were avowed from almost every pulpit in Cambridge. His church was crowded with young students. . . . The writer of these lines can never forget the impression made on his mind by the appearance of the church when Mr. Simeon delivered one of his sermons on the Holy Spirit before that learned university, about six years since. The vast edifice was literally crowded in every part. The heads of houses, the doctors, the masters of arts, the bachelors, the undergraduates, the congregation from the town, seemed to vie with each other in eagerness to hear the aged and venerable man. His figure is now before me. His fixed countenance, his bold and yet respectful manner of address, his admirable delivery of a well-prepared discourse, his pointed appeal to the different classes of his auditory, the mute attention with which they hung upon his lips, all composed the most solemn scene I had ever witnessed. And at his death, when did either of our universities pay such a marked honor to a private individual ? ”

An analogous effect was produced in a German academic community by Tholuck, a preacher of quite different personal traits, and with a theology in important respects unlike that of Simeon. He was called to be professor at Halle in 1826, when the university there was under the control of Rationalism. Stigmatized as a “ pietist,” he was met at the threshold by demonstrations of dislike and contempt. His preaching and teaching aroused a virulent opposition. But this by degrees gave way ; and, long before he died, he saw the university, owing to a great extent to his exertions and influence, in sympathy with the Evangelical cause. From his side a multitude of students went forth to disseminate the truth which he had so fervently taught them in personal converse, from the pulpit, and from his academic chair.

For illustrations of the power of the gospel, in these later times, to work out great results in individual experience, and, through the influence upon society, of believers, animated by the Christian spirit, the reader must resort to the volumes of Christian biography. It is only through the details of personal history that a vivid impression is gained of the power that is stored up in the gospel, now as in the past, to inspire the human soul with affections and hopes that reach into the world unseen, and to furnish the motives and means of social reform. A single example may here be referred to—that of Chalmers, the renowned preacher of Scotland. He was a man robust in his mental as well as physical constitution, a man of a clear head as well as a warm heart, against

F. A. G. Tholuck, 1799-1877.

Thomas Chalmers.

whom the accusation of morbid natural tendencies, which is often made against devout men, could never be brought. It will be remembered that he was, moreover, a mathematician of uncommon ability, versed, also, in natural science and in political economy. In 1803, he became the pastor of Kilmany, a parish nine miles from St. Andrew's. He inculcated in his sermons the maxims of morality, but the practical results of his preaching were small. At length the death of several relatives, and a severe attack of illness, from which he fully recovered, induced him to reflect on the foundations of his own religious character, and on the need of a spirit of faith and hope which he was conscious of not possessing. A radical change now took place in his views and feelings respecting Christ and the way of salvation. The character and effect of it are thus described by himself in an address to the parish of Kilmany, in 1815 :

“And here I can but record the effect of an actual, though undesigned, experiment which I prosecuted for upwards of twelve years among you. For the greater part of that time I could expatiate on the meanness of dishonesty, on the villainy of falsehood, on the despicable evils of calumny ; in a word, upon all those deformities of character which awaken the natural indignation of the human heart against the pests and disturbers of human society. Now, could I, upon the strength of these warm expostulations, have got a thief to give up his stealing, and the evil-speaker his censoriousness, and the liar his deviations from the truth, I should have felt the repose of one who has gotten his ultimate object. It never occurred to me that all this might have been done, and yet the soul of every hearer have remained in full alienation from God ; and that even could I have established in the bosom of one who stole, such a principle of abhorrence at the meanness of dishonesty, that he was prevailed upon to steal no more, he might still have retained a heart as completely unturned to God, and as totally unpossessed by a principle of love to him as before. In a word, though I might have made him a more upright and honorable man, I might have left him as destitute of the essence of religious principle as ever. But the interesting fact is, that during the whole of that period, in which I made no attempt against the natural enmity of the mind to God ; while I was inattentive to the way in which that enmity is dissolved, even by the free offer on the one hand, and the believing acceptance on the other of the gospel salvation ; while Christ, through whose blood the sinner, who by nature stands afar off, is brought near to the heavenly law-giver whom he has offended, was scarcely ever spoken of, or spoken of in such a way as stripped him of all the importance of his character and offices—even at this time, I certainly did press the reformations of honor and truth and integrity among my people, but I never once heard of any such reformations having been effected among them. If there was anything brought about in this way, it was more than I ever got any account of. I am not sensible that all the vehemence with which I urged the virtues and the proprieties of social life had the weight of a feather on the moral habits of my parishioners. And it

was not till I got impressed by the utter alienation of the heart, in all its desires and affections, from God ; it was not till reconciliation to him became the distinct and pre-eminent object of my ministerial exertions ; it was not till I took the scriptural way of laying the method of reconciliation before them ; it was not till the free offer of forgiveness through the blood of Christ was urged upon their acceptance ; the Holy Spirit, given through the channel of Christ's mediatorship to all who ask him, was set before them as the unceasing object of their dependence and their prayers ; in one word, it was not till the contemplations of my people were turned to these great and essential elements in the business of a soul providing for its interests with God and the concerns of its eternity, that I ever heard of these subordinate reformations, which aforetime made the earnest and the zealous, but, I am afraid, at the same time, the ultimate object of my earlier ministrations. Ye servants, whose scrupulous fidelity has now attracted the notice, and drawn forth in my hearing a delightful testimony from your masters, what mischief ye would have done had your zeal for doctrines and sacraments been accompanied by the sloth and remissness, and what, in the prevailing tone of moral relaxation, is accounted the allowable purloining of your earlier days ! But a sense of your heavenly master's eye has brought another influence to bear upon you ; and while you are thus striving to adorn the doctrine of your God and Saviour in all things, you may, poor as you are, reclaim the great ones of the land to the acknowledgment of the faith. You have, at least, taught me, that to preach Christ is the only effective way of preaching morality in all its branches ; and out of your humble cottages have I gathered a lesson which I pray God I may be enabled to carry with all its simplicity into a wider theatre, and to bring with all the power of its subduing efficacy upon the vices of a more crowded population."

Transferred to the Tron Church in Glasgow, Chalmers became known as one of the most eloquent preachers in Great Britain.

But he left his crowded congregation to take charge of St. John's Church, in the same city, a new organization, where the attendants were mostly working people, and where he had the opportunity to carry out cherished plans for pastoral visitation, for systematic instruction by the establishment of schools, and of other agencies by which the gospel could be carried to the mass of the people and into every household. His untiring labors were crowned with wonderful success. All his schemes, it should be observed, for the aid of the poor were as judicious as they were kind. The needy were trained to depend as far as possible on themselves. The great things that were done in Glasgow, Chalmers tried to have done everywhere in Scotland. The leader in the organization of the Free Church, an orator in the pulpit who preached the truths of the gospel with a fervor which thrilled the multitudes that thronged to hear him wherever he went, and a teacher, both of doctrinal theology, and of religion in its relations

Chalmers at
Glasgow.

to science and to economical problems, he exerted an influence, too great to be measured, upon his country and the generation to which he belonged. Yet it is plain from the record of his life that the secret of his power, the force that kindled into life all his talents and acquisitions, was in that experience which moulded his spirit anew, in the parish at Kilmany.

The more consistent and complete casting away of the ascetic ideal is a characteristic of Protestant piety in recent times. Occasionally, the strong influence of that ideal continued to be manifest. This is a peculiarity and a defect of a religious work, which has before been mentioned, Law's "Serious Call,"—respecting which a late writer remarks: "No room is left for any of the great interests, political, social, artistic, scientific, which exercise and train the faculties of mankind, and are the cement and adornment of civilized life; they belong to the world, and with the world they must be renounced." But the ascetic ideal has more and more ceased to tinge the conceptions formed of the Christian character. While this change has been taking place, there has been a growing disposition to carry the work of reform into every department of human life.

During the century past, Christian activity has been exerted, more, perhaps, than ever, in various forms of philanthropy, which relate not only to the spiritual well-being of men, but also to their temporal welfare and comfort. In the eighteenth century, there was a strong humanitarian impulse at the root of the revolutionary uprisings and of the struggle for human rights. The evangelical revivals, contemporaneous, or subsequent to these political movements, had the effect of stimulating the development of the forms of benevolence to which reference has been made. An "enthusiasm of humanity" gradually arose, truly Christian in its sources, which has sought to lighten the burdens of all classes whose earthly lot is adapted to excite compassion. One side of this philanthropy has been manifest in the growing aversion to cruelty of every kind, even to that negative cruelty which consists in the neglect of the unfortunate whom it is possible to relieve. In a thousand ways, endeavors have been put forth to alleviate human suffering, including even that suffering of criminals which is not requisite for their restraint and reformation, or, in the case of capital offences, to put an end to their lives. A peculiarity of philanthropic activity is the tendency to associated effort. Societies are formed for a great variety of specific benevolent works. The existence of associations for the prevention of cruelty to animals

is a sign of the prevalent recoil from the infliction of pain, even upon the lowest of sentient beings, and of the habit of prosecuting labors of benevolence by organized effort.

Among the fruits of Christian benevolence which are worthy of special remark, is the institution of Sunday-schools. In the town of Gloucester, in England, there was a pin-factory where numerous children were employed, either living there, or from neighboring places. They gathered in the streets on Sundays, and their filthy attire, their coarse, rough ways, and their profanity, drew to them the attention and the pity of Robert Raikes, an intelligent printer, and publisher of a newspaper. In 1781, he hired several women to open schools for them on Sundays, and he persuaded the children to attend. So marked with good sense were his arrangements that the schools were highly successful in securing the reform and good conduct of the pupils. The fame of the experiment spread abroad. Similar schools were established in many other towns and cities. A very important improvement was the securing of volunteer teachers, who did their work from love, without compensation. Under Wesley's influence, the Methodists had begun to give Sunday-school instruction in this way. The school founded by Raikes was for the poor alone; but as the institution spread over Great Britain and the United States, children of all classes became the recipients of instruction in connection with it. Since 1864, Sunday-schools have been introduced into Germany.

In promoting improvement in the condition of prisons and in the treatment of prisoners, an important branch of Christian benevolence, great services were rendered by John Howard. He fully deserves the title of "the Philanthropist," which is commonly affixed to his name. On a voyage to Spain, he was captured by a French privateer and taken into Brest. There the way in which prisoners of war were treated made a strong impression on his mind. Appointed, in 1773, high sheriff of Bedford, he investigated the condition of the jail there, and then visited many other prisons in England and Wales. He was shocked by the filthy, unhealthy condition in which he found them, and by the evils that grew out of the dependence of the jailors for their support on the fees which they could extort from their inmates. Prisoners who had served out their time were often compelled to stay in prison for a long period, merely from want of means to discharge these dues. By laborious exertions, Howard procured the enactment of laws giving a fixed stipend to the keepers of prisons.

He undertook, at his own cost, extensive journeys through France, Germany, and other countries on the Continent, that he might ascertain, by personal inspection, the methods used in the construction of prisons and their management. In these inquiries he avoided no danger to health or life, in order to possess himself of exact and complete information. The effect of his reports was the enactment of laws in England for the better regulation of prisons, with a view to the reformation of prisoners and their training in habits of industry. In the closing part of his life, Howard undertook other long and toilsome journeys for the purpose of inquiring into the spread of the plague, and other contagious diseases, and of devising means of preventing it. He visited numerous lazarettos, and even sailed in a foul ship from Smyrna to Venice—which was attacked by pirates on the voyage—in order to have a personal experience of quarantine discipline. Finally, on his way to Constantinople, he died in Cherson, on the Black Sea, from attending a girl who was sick of a camp fever. His courage was equal to his benevolence. Utterly free from ambition, he desired no praise and no memorial of his kind deeds. “Give me no monument;” “let me be forgotten,” were his words—the words of one who delighted to do good for its own sake.

About twenty years after the death of Howard the work of prison reform was taken up anew by a group of men and women, Elizabeth Fry. 1780-1845. several of whom were of the Society of Friends. Of these it was Elizabeth Gurney Fry by whom the most striking work of benevolence was achieved. The Acts of Parliament had become, to a great extent, a dead letter. The prisons in which offenders of both sexes were immured were damp and loathsome. “Dirt and disease abounded; and even where the building contained wards and yards, the women were imperfectly separated from the men, whilst idleness, gambling, drinking, and swearing were habitual amongst them.” The prisons were crowded, “for crime had enormously increased, and convictions had more than doubled within the ten preceding years”—1806 to 1816. Mrs. Fry’s work began in the women’s department of the Newgate prison. In this place, there were huddled together hundreds of offenders of very different grades of guilt, with their children, who were almost naked and perishing for want of food, air, and exercise. The inmates of this place were “in an unchecked condition of idleness, riot, and vice of every description.” They exhibited a scene of discord and violence which it was terrible to witness. On her second visit, Mrs. Fry, at her own request, was left alone

amongst the women for some hours. She read to them the parable of the lord of the vineyard, in the twentieth chapter of Matthew. She added remarks on the eleventh hour, and on the willingness of Christ to save sinners, even the most depraved. "Some asked who Christ was; others feared that their day of salvation was past." To Mrs. Fry's proposal that there should be a school set up for the children, their mothers thankfully consented, and selected a governess, a young woman who had been sentenced for stealing a watch. She was one of the first converts to Christ. Mrs. Fry, from time to time, visited those who were sentenced to be hanged—some of them for forgery, committed under circumstances of aggravated temptation. To these she carried the messages of the gospel with consoling effect. The idea that industry and order could be brought into Newgate was regarded by the officers of the prison as visionary; but by her personal influence, with the assistance of others whose aid she secured, she wrought such a transformation of character and behavior among the female convicts as seemed little short of miraculous. The prison was visited by large numbers, including persons of the highest rank, to see with their own eyes the wonders which had been accomplished. The reforms which Mrs. Fry effected spread to other places. By her efforts a most beneficent change was made in the arrangements of the ships for transporting convicts, and in the way in which they were received and treated on landing in the penal colonies. Her labors were not confined to Great Britain. She visited France, Belgium, Holland, and other countries. Her correspondence in the interest of the cause which she served, extended to Russia and Italy. Her recommendations bore good fruit in almost all parts of Europe.

Signal improvements in the construction of prisons, and in their interior life, have been effected under the auspices of Prison Discipline Societies in the United States and England. Separate establishments for the detention, reform, and training of juvenile offenders have been created. The opposition to transporting criminals to the English colonial communities finally succeeded in putting an end to this practice.

We can go no further here than to touch briefly on some of the most prominent forms of philanthropy which, in later times, have been the offspring of Christian feeling. The reform of criminal law kept pace with the improvement of prisons and prison-discipline. An impulse to such a reform was given in 1764 by the publication of the little treatise

Prison
discipline.

Reform of
criminal
law.

"On Crimes and Punishments," by the Italian writer, Beccaria. He discussed in a lucid manner the design of legal penalties, and presented rational and humane views respecting them. In Great Britain, one of the leaders in this species of law reform was Sir Samuel Romilly (1757-1818); and the good work which he commenced was successfully carried forward by Sir James Mackintosh. The diminution of the number of capital offences was attended by a striking diminution of crime. Righteous and humane laws have been enacted for the protection of women and children employed in mines and factories. The exposure by a royal commission in England, in 1842, of the wretched condition of women and children who worked in the mines, resulted in immediate action by Parliament, forbidding the employment of children under ten and women in such work. The measures known as Factory Acts, culminating in the Consolidating Act of 1878, contained sanitary pro-

Factory
Acts.

visions, regulations for the safety of laborers, for the restriction of the hours of labor, for insuring to the workmen holidays, and for their comfort and pecuniary help in case of accidents. Other Acts of Parliament have entered into the details of industrial occupations. Some of them have reference to the health of the laborers, others to the time and place of paying to them their wages. We cannot pass over the evidences of progress which appear in the more kind and reasonable methods of caring for lunatics, and in the erection of hospitals and other institutions in most Christian countries for the relief of different classes of sufferers who were formerly neglected. The measures which have been adopted in modern times, by public authority and by voluntary exertions, for mitigating the sufferings occasioned by war, must be traced to the influence of Christian sentiment.

Mitigation
of suffer-
ings by
war.

The right of an invading force to ravage the territory of an enemy has seldom been practically asserted in this century. According to the modern rules of war, non-combatants are not to be molested. Their property, if it is taken, is to be paid for at its fair value. It is no longer held to be a crime for an officer to hold a fortress as long as he can. In the case of the sick and the wounded, there has been a great change for the better. The ambulance system was established by the French, in 1795. A French surgeon first devised the plan of a corps of stretcher-bearers. By the European convention adopted at Geneva, in 1864, the wounded, and the official staff connected with ambulances, were exempted from capture as prisoners of war. Florence Nightingale, an English lady who, during the Crimean War,

went out at the head of a company of volunteer nurses to take care of the sick and wounded, has been followed by others in like benevolent undertakings. The efforts of Christian men to devise ways for preventing the occurrence of wars have not been without a measure of success. The method of settling international disputes by arbitration is regarded with increasing favor. It was adopted with happy results at the close of the American Civil War, for the settlement of controversies between Great Britain and the United States. But the existence of vast military establishments in the Continental countries, draining the resources of the inhabitants, and acting as a constant provocation to hostilities, still remains as a reproach to Christian civilization.

Laws have been enacted in most European countries and in the United States for the suppression of illiteracy and for the educa-

Education. tion of the whole people in the elementary branches of knowledge. The abolition of slavery and of the slave-trade is an achievement of the present century. Early in the last century, and even before, as soon as the barbarities connected with the slave-trade were understood, it began to be denounced by good men in Great Britain. The first concerted effort for its abolition was made by the Quakers, who, in 1761, excluded from their society all who should take part in it. By the efforts of Granville Sharp, a decision was obtained, in 1772, from Lord Mansfield, that a slave could not be held in England or carried out of it. During the period of the American Revolution, anti-slavery societies were formed in Pennsylvania and also in France, Lafayette being one of the promoters of the cause. The slave-trade was prohibited by Denmark through a law that took effect in 1802, by Great Britain in 1807, and by the United States through an act which was passed in 1807, and came into force on January 1, 1808. The agitation which led, in 1833, to the abolition of slavery in the British colonies, was carried forward by Wilberforce, Clarkson, Buxton, and other active coadjutors. The founders of the American Republic were in principle opposed to slavery. This was the conviction of Washington, who emancipated his slaves in his will, of Jefferson, and Patrick Henry, as well as of the statesmen in the North. For a long time, the hope was entertained that slavery would be gradually abolished by the colonization of the freed blacks in Africa. As was true of the English abolitionists, in the earlier stages of their agitation, some scheme of gradual emancipation was alone held to be feasible. One of the earliest advocates of immediate emancipation in America was

Slavery and
the slave-
trade.

William Lloyd Garrison. This proposal was resisted by a large number of those who professed to desire the extinction of slavery by a slower process. Following upon the great increase of the slave population, and the immense increase in the cotton crop, the feeling spread in the South that it was impracticable to get rid of slavery, and Southern Christians sought to defend the institution on scriptural grounds and as expedient for both races. About the year 1839, the abolitionists in the North divided into two parties. The obligations respecting slavery, imposed by the Federal Constitution on the Northern States, were such as moved Garrison, and those who sympathized with him, to come out in vehement advocacy of disunion. He contended for opinions respecting the rights of women and non-resistance which were obnoxious to many who had acted with him. His denunciation of slave-holders was felt by many to be unjust and extravagant. In 1840, a new National Anti-Slavery party was formed; and the warfare on slavery by a distinct political organization began. The dread of disunion and a sense of the duties laid upon the free States by the Constitution, were prominent among the motives which led not a few Northern ministers and churches to stand aloof from the abolitionists, especially from those who followed the banner of Garrison. Political abolitionism, which aimed to exclude slavery from the Territories, and to shut up the institution within the States where it was under the shield of local law, grew in strength, and finally triumphed in the election of Lincoln to the Presidency. The secession of the Southern States and the overthrow of the Confederacy which they formed, were followed by the Constitutional Amendments which prohibit slavery everywhere in the United States. Thus—not, however, without a bloody civil war—liberty for all the inhabitants of the land, and union, were both secured. Since the war, praiseworthy efforts have been made, involving large outlays of money, for the Christian education of the emancipated blacks.

One of the most notable efforts of modern philanthropy is the moral crusade against the vice of drunkenness. The temperance reform has achieved the largest results in Great Britain and in the United States. The exertions of a host of lecturers and of countless societies have been seconded by various legislative measures for preventing or checking the traffic in intoxicating liquor. As an additional security for the tempted, the pledge of total abstinence has been taken probably by millions of persons. A famous leader in this crusade was "Father Matthew"

The temper-
ance reform.

—Theobald Matthew—a priest in Cork, Ireland, who began his labors in 1838. His work was first among the lower classes in his own country, every district of which he visited. He traversed Great Britain, and spent two years in the United States. Wherever he went, his exertions were crowned with success. It is said that, in Glasgow, in one day, he administered the pledge to ten thousand persons.

A growing sense of the evils arising from the divided condition of the Church is one of the signs of the times. It is remarkable that in connection with an increased activity in building up the separate denominations, there has been developed in them, severally, a disposition to enter into closer relations of fraternal sympathy and intercourse with other Christian bodies. Great doctrinal conflicts which raged at a former day, like those of Arminianism and Calvinism, have subsided. Even the standing controversy of Protestantism and the Church of Rome is waged with a better appreciation on either side of that which is deserving of respect in the adverse party, and a juster estimate of the weight to be attached to the points held in common. As one fact betokening the disposition of Protestants to join against common foes, instead of wasting their energies in mutual contests, mention may be made of the Evangelical Alliance. This was formed in 1846 in London by eight hundred ministers and laymen, representing the principal Protestant denominations in Europe and America. As indicating the class of persons whom it was thought desirable to include in the Alliance, a statement of doctrine under nine heads was sanctioned. Co-ordinate branches of the Alliance were formed in different countries. By the American branch “the Divine-human person and atoning work” of Christ was declared to be “the heart and soul of Christianity.” Prolonged sessions of the Alliance have been held at intervals in Europe. It met in New York in 1873. At these meetings there have been convened persons eminent for learning and piety, speaking different languages, and worshipping under varying creeds and forms. It is not chiefly, however, in public movements of this sort that the yearning of Christian people for closer relations and direct co-operation has expressed itself. In America and Great Britain, the Young Men’s Christian Association in numerous places has drawn into its membership a multitude of persons from different denominations. Branches of it have been established on the Continent of Europe, and even in the East, as far as India and China. Affiliated together, and holding representative conventions at regu-

Christian
union.

The Evangeli-
cal Alliance.

lar intervals, are not less than thirty-five hundred societies, although the first organizations grew up at Montreal and Boston as recently as 1851. The active members are required to be members of Evangelical churches. The qualification of associate members is good moral character. The first object of the Association is defined to be "the salvation of young men through faith in Christ." With this is connected the promotion of "their intellectual, social, and spiritual welfare," through agencies which are stamped with a religious character. The work done by these societies is, to a large extent, distinctively Christian work—work that pertains to the Church of Christ. It is by such undercurrents that the drift of the times is indicated, quite as truly as by noisy movements on the surface. The existence of this great international Association is only one of the signs of the times which point in the same direction. The barriers of sect are surmounted by the coming together of Christians from different folds in a thousand charitable undertakings.

In still other ways, the spiritual unity of Christian disciples, the consciousness of which must precede any hopeful experiments to secure organic union, is evinced. More and more, the same religious literature finds its way into the households of the diverse Christian organizations. There are devotional books to which all extend a welcome. The "Imitation of Christ," which is dear to the Roman Catholic devotee, deeply impresses Wesley and Whitefield, and is sent forth among Scottish Presbyterians with a commendatory preface by Chalmers. The same hymns are sung in the sanctuaries and at the firesides of disciples of every name.

In this place, it is convenient to speak of the treasury of English hymns, which may be said to be the creation of the modern period. Prior to Watts, there were some excellent hymns written by English authors. Such are the Morning Hymn and the Evening Hymn of Bishop Ken, and the doxology which he composed—"Praise God, from whom all blessings flow." Such are the hymns of Addison, "The spacious firmament on high," and, "When all thy mercies, O my God." But it was Watts who made an epoch in the history of sacred song. Doddridge wrote, "Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love," and other hymns of merit. The most fertile of all hymn-writers was Charles Wesley. "Jesus, lover of my soul," is only one of a considerable number of his lyrics which are prized by all English-speaking Christians. "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds" was one of

Christian
literature.

Hymns.

the productions of John Newton, included in the "Olney Hymns"—where appeared, also, the hymns of Cowper, of which, "God moves in a mysterious way," is one of the best. Anne Steele, James Montgomery, Bowring—who wrote, "Watchman, tell us of the night;" Trench, Keble—the author of "The Christian Year"—Heber, Faber, Bonar, are only a few of the names of hymn-writers who have become well known to Christian worshippers in England and America. Few hymns are more prized than Cardinal Newman's "Lead, kindly light." American writers have added to the hymnals of all the churches some contributions of acknowledged worth. Such are President Dwight's hymn, "I love thy kingdom, Lord," and the hymn by Ray Palmer, "My faith looks up to thee."

APPENDIX.

I. GENERAL COUNCILS.*

A.D.

- I. 325. Nicea I. The Arian Controversy.
 - II. 381. Constantinople I. The Apollinarian Controversy.
 - III. 431. Ephesus. The Nestorian Controversy.
 - IV. 451. Chalcedon. The Eutychian Controversy.
 - V. 553. Constantinople II. Controversy respecting the Three Chapters.
 - VI. 680-81. Constantinople III. (The Trullan Council). Controversy respecting two Wills in Christ.
 - VII. 787. Nicea II. The Worship of Images. The first VII. General Councils are received in common by the Greeks and the Latins.
 - VIII. 869. Constantinople IV. Controversy of Ignatius and Photius. This Council was rejected by the Greeks. Their VIIIth. General Council was held in Constantinople in 879, and was rejected by the Latins.
The Councils after the VIIIth. are rejected by the Greeks.
 - IX. 1123. Lateran I. Investiture: Confirms the Worms Concordat.
 - X. 1139. Lateran II. Termination of a Schism. Condemns the Doctrines of Arnold of Brescia.
 - XI. 1179. Lateran III. Relating to Discipline. Rules for the Choice of a Pope.
 - XII. 1215. Lateran IV. Assertion of Papal Authority.
 - XIII. 1245. Lyons I. (reckoned by some as Lateran V.). Pope and Emperor: Deposes Frederic II.
 - XIV. 1274. Lyons II. Concessions of Rudolph of Hapsburg. New Rules for the choice of a Pope, etc.
 - XV. 1311. Vienne (recognized by Lateran, 1512). Suppression of the Templars, etc.
 - XVI. 1414-18. Constance (the last sessions acknowledged by Rome, the whole by France). Condemnation of Huss.
 - XVII. 1431-49. Basel. First Twenty-five sessions received by Rome, until its removal to Ferrara. The Council of Florence, 1438, regarded by Rome as a continuation of the first sessions of Basel.
 - XVIII. 1512-18. Lateran V.
 - XIX. 1545-63. Trent.
 - XX. Vatican. Infallibility of the Pope decreed.
- [Another order of the Councils (Basel being rejected): XV., Vienne; XVI., Constance; XVII., Florence; XVIII., Trent. Still another order (Basel being reckoned as distinct): XVII., Basel; XVIII., Florence; XIX., Lateran V.; XX., Trent. The contested councils are Sardica, 344 (considered œcumenical by the Latins); the Trullan, Quinisextum, 692 (received by Greek Church); Vienne, Pisa, Constance, Basel, and Lateran V. (which within the Latin Church are disputed).]

* Altered and enlarged from Smith's "Church History in Chronological Tables."

II.

LIST OF POPES FROM GREGORY I. TO LEO XIII.*

Gregory I. , 590-604	Sergius II. , 844-847
Sabinianus , 604-606 (?)	Leo IV. , 847-855
Boniface III. , 607 (?)	Benedict III. , 855-858
Boniface IV. , 608-615 (?)	Nicholas I. , 858-867
Deusdedit , 615-618 (?)	Hadrian II. , 867-872 (?)
Boniface V. , 619-625 (?)	John VIII. , 872-882
Honorius I. , 625-638	Marinus , 882-884
Severinus , 640	Hadrian III. , 884-885
John IV. , 640-642	Stephen V. , 885-891
Theodore I. , 642-649	Formosus , 891-896
Martin I. , 649-653, dep. ; d. 655	Boniface VI. , 896
Eugenius I. , 654-657	Stephen VI. , 896-897
Vitalianus , 657-672	Romanus , 897 (?)
Adeodatus , 672-676	Theodore II. , 898
Donus I. , 676-678	John IX. , 898-900
Agatho , 678-682 (?)	Benedict IV. , 900-903
Leo II. , 682-683 (?)	Leo V. , 903, dep.
Benedict II. , 684-685	Christopher , 903-904, dep.
John V. , 685-686 (?)	Sergius III. , 904-911
Cono , 686-687	Anastasius III. , 911-913
Theodorus , 687	Lando , 913-914
Sergius I. , 687-701	John X. , 914-928
John VI. , 701-705	Leo VI. , 928-929
John VII. , 705-707	Stephen VII. , 929-931
Sisinnius , 708	John XI. , 931-936
Constantine , 708-715	Leo VII. , 936-939
Gregory II. , 715-731	Stephen VIII. , 939-942
Gregory III. , 731-741	Martin III. , or Marinus II. , 942-946
Zacharias , 741-752	Agapetus II. , 946-955
Stephen , 752, died before consecration	John XII. , 956-963, dep.
Stephen II. , 752-757	Leo VIII. , 963-965
Paul I. , 757-767	BENEDICT V. , 964-965
CONSTANTINE , usurper, 767-768	John XIII. , 965-972
Stephen III. , 768-772	Benedict VI. , 972-974
Hadrian I. , 772-795	BONIFACE VII. , 974, driven into exile
Leo III. , 795-816	Donus II. , 974
Stephen IV. , 816-817	Benedict VII. , 975-983 (?)
Pascal I. , 817-824	John XIV. , 983-984
Eugenius II. , 824-827	BONIFACE VII. , again—d. 985
Valentine , 827 (?)	John XV. , never lawfully consecrated, d. 985
Gregory IV. , 827-844 (?)	

* Abbreviated from George's "Chronological Tables." The interrogation mark signifies doubt or dispute as to the date.

- John XV.**, 985-996
Gregory V., 996-999
Silvester II., 999-1003
John XVII., 1003
John XVIII., 1003-1009, res.
Sergius IV., 1009-1012 (?)
Benedict VIII., 1012-1024
John XIX., 1024-1033
Benedict IX., 1033-1048, res. ; de-
 posed 1044, and restored on death
 of Silvester III. ; sold the papacy
 to Gregory VI. ; restored again on
 death of Clement II.
Damasus II., 1048
Leo IX., 1048-1054
Victor II., 1055-1057
Stephen IX., 1057-1058
Nicholas II., 1058-1061
Alexander II., 1061-1073
Gregory VII., 1073-1085
Victor III., 1086-1087
Urban II., 1088-1099
Pascal II., 1099-1118
Gelasius II., 1118-1119
Calixtus II., 1119-1124
Honorius II., 1124-1130
Innocent II., 1130-1143
Celestine II., 1143-1144
Lucius II., 1144-1145
Eugenius III., 1145-1153
Anastasius IV., 1153-1154
Hadrian IV., 1154-1159
Alexander III., 1159-1181

Lucius III., 1181-1185
Urban III., 1185-1187
Gregory VIII., 1187
Clement III., 1187-1191
Celestine III., 1191-1198
Innocent III., 1198-1216
Honorius III., 1216-1227
Gregory IX., 1227-1241
Celestine IV., 1241 ; died before con-
 secration
Innocent IV., 1243-1254
Alexander IV., 1254-1261
- ANTIPOPPES.
JOHN XVI., 997-998

SILVESTER III., 1044
Gregory VI., 1045-1046, dep.
Clement II., 1046-1047

Clement II., 1046-1047

BENEDICT X., 1058-1059, dep.

CLEMENT III., 1080-1100

ALBERT, 1102
SILVESTER IV., 1105-1111
GREGORY VIII., 1118-1121

ANACLETUS II., 1130-1138
GREGORIUS, 1138

VICTOR IV., 1159-1164
PASCAL III., 1164-1168
CALIXTUS III., 1168-1178
INNOCENT III., 1178-1180

Urban IV., 1261-1264

Clement IV., 1265-1268

Vacancy till election of Gregory X.,
1271

Gregory X., 1271-1276

Innocent V., 1276

Hadrian V., 1276; died before conse-
cration

John XXI., 1276-1277

Nicholas III., 1277-1280

Martin IV., 1281-1285

Honorius IV., 1285-1287

Nicholas IV., 1288-1292

Celestine V., 1294, res.; d. 1296

Boniface VIII., 1294-1303

Benedict XI., 1303-1304

Clement V., 1305-1314

John XXII., 1316-1334

Benedict XII., 1334-1342

Clement VI., 1342-1352

Innocent VI., 1352-1362

Urban V., 1362-1370

Gregory XI., 1370-1378

} In Avignon.

THE GREAT SCHISM.

ROME.

Urban VI., 1378-1389

Boniface IX., 1389-1404

Innocent VII., 1404-
1406

Gregory XII., 1406- **Alexander V.**, 1409-
1415, res.; d. 1419 1410

John XXIII., 1410-1415,
dep.; d. 1419

In 1415 the Council of Constance deposed John
XXIII., induced Gregory XII. to resign, and elected

Martin V., 1417-1431 **CLEMENT VIII.**, 1424-
1429, res.

Eugenius IV., 1431- **FELIX V.**, elected 1439 by
1447 Council of Basel, res.
1449

Nicholas V., 1447-1455

Calixtus III., 1455-1458

Pius II., 1458-1464

Paul II., 1464-1471

Sixtus IV., 1471-1484

Innocent VIII., 1484-1492
Alexander VI., 1492-1503
Pius III., 1503
Julius II., 1503-1513
Leo X., 1513-1521
Adrian VI., 1522-1523
Clement VII., 1523-1534
Paul III., 1534-1549
Julius III., 1550-1555
Marcellus II., 1555
Paul IV., 1555-1559
Pius IV., 1559-1565
Pius V., 1566-1572
Gregory XIII., 1572-1585
Sixtus V., 1585-1590
Urban VII., 1590
Gregory XIV., 1590-1591
Innocent IX., 1591
Clement VIII., 1592-1605
Leo XI., 1605
Paul V., 1605-1621
Gregory XV., 1621-1623

Urban VIII., 1623-1644
Innocent X., 1644-1655
Alexander VII., 1655-1667
Clement IX., 1667-1669
Clement X., 1670-1676
Innocent XI., 1676-1689
Alexander VIII., 1689-1691
Innocent XII., 1691-1700
Clement XI., 1700-1721
Innocent XIII., 1721-1724
Benedict XIII., 1724-1730
Clement XII., 1730-1740
Benedict XIV., 1740-1758
Clement XIII., 1758-1769
Clement XIV., 1769-1774
Pius VI., 1775-1799
Pius VII., 1800-1823
Leo XII., 1823-1829
Pius VIII., 1829-1830
Gregory XVI., 1831-1846
Pius IX., 1846-1878
Leo XIII., 1878—

III.

NOTES ON THE LITERATURE OF CHURCH HISTORY.*

HISTORY OF THE LITERATURE IN THIS DEPARTMENT.

THE oldest work on the history of the Church is the *Acts of the Apostles*, by Luke. Shortly after 150 A.D., Hegesippus, a Jewish (but not judaizing) Christian, wrote accounts of the Church. He had travelled and made personal inquiries. The few fragments that remain of his work are in Routh (*Rel. Sacr.*, i., pp. 207-219), and Grabe (*Synecilegium*, ii., 203-214). The father of Church History is Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea (c. 265-c. 340), a man of great learning and influence. His History of the Church comes down to 324 A.D. He had in his hands numerous lost writers. His own work is invaluable. Although not specially critical, he means to be truthful. He has little to say of the Latin churches. His *Life of Constantine*, whom he knew well, is a panegyric. There is a thorough account of the Life and Writings of Eusebius, by Bishop Lightfoot, in Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. The "continuators" of Eusebius were Theodoret, Sozomen, and Socrates, in the fifth century, and Theodorus and Evagrius in the sixth; but these writers partly cover the same ground. Evagrius closes at 594 A.D. The Arian Church historian was Philostorgius (368-c. 425). His work begins with the Arian controversy, and extends to 423 A.D. Only excerpts remain, as preserved in Photius, a writer of the ninth century. They are reprinted in Migne's "Patrology." Rufinus (d. 410) translated Eusebius into Latin, and added two books of his own, carrying the narrative down to A.D. 395.

From the Patristic Age to the end of the mediæval era, historical writings were uncritical, and chiefly of a fragmentary character. The *History of the Franks*, by Gregory, Bishop of Tours, is the most valuable source for early French history. He is credulous, but veracious. According to a custom of chroniclers, he starts with the creation. As he approaches near his own date he becomes more and more trustworthy. As a picture of his times his work is precious. The Venerable Bede (673-735) wrote the *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*, a history of Anglo-Saxon Christianity, with a preliminary compilation on the earlier history of Britain. Paulus Diaconus (c. 720-

* It will be understood that the lists of books here given are selected from a very voluminous literature. Could these notes be extended, other titles, under the different topics, would justly claim a place. The student should bear in mind that, under the several subjects and eras, the general works (on p. 673 sqq.) and the dictionaries and encyclopædias (on p. 676) are often the most valuable sources of knowledge, although it has not been thought necessary to multiply particular references to them.

c. 800) wrote, in a truthful and impartial spirit, a history of the Lombards, which he brought down to 744 A.D., and left unfinished. Adam of Bremen (d. c. 1076) composed a history of the Archbishops of Hamburg-Bremen down to 1072. Sharing in the superstitions of his time, yet honest and impartial, he is the principal authority for early Scandinavian Church history. The *Liber Pontificalis* is made up of biographies of Roman bishops from the Apostle Peter to near the close of the ninth century (891). Bartholomæus of Lucca (d. 1327) composed a general Church history (in twenty-four books), reaching as far as 1312. Oderic Vitalis, Abbot of St. Evreul, in Normandy, wrote a Church history (in thirteen books), extending to 1142. The secular chroniclers of the Middle Ages, in the different nations, such as Matthew of Paris (d. 1259), William of Tyre (c. 1190), who was the author of a history of the Crusades from 1100 to 1184, describe the affairs of Church as well as of State. Toward the close of the mediæval era there was an increased interest in history. Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264) wrote his *Speculum Historiale* (in thirty-one books), the 3d part of his *Speculum Majus*. A more critical spirit arose, as is seen in the writings of Laurentius Valla (d. 1457), who disputed the genuineness of the alleged Donation of Constantine.

Besides the works referred to above, there were produced, in the Middle Ages, numberless writings of an historical character relating to the lives of popes, monks, and other persons of local or general celebrity, the rise and the achievements of monastic orders, etc. To separate fact from fiction is the task of the critic, which can never be fully accomplished. Many of these writings are embraced in the great collection of the Bollandists, the *Acta Sanctorum*.

The controversies of the Reformation were essentially connected with investigations in Church history. In the Lutheran Church appeared (1559-1574), in 13 volumes, the *Magdeburg Centuries*, the production of Matthias Flacius and his coadjutors, Magdeburg being the seat of their labors. The arrangement was by centuries, with fifteen chapters, or rubrics, in each. It is polemical in its design, one great object being to show how the Church was corrupted through the Papacy. Although clumsy in its literary execution, it is the fruit of great erudition. By way of counterpoise, the *Ecclesiastical Annals* of Baronius were composed. He had free access to the Vatican library. His industry was astonishing. His contributions to knowledge were important. His method is to take up each year by itself, giving what occurred in that year, and then passing to the next. He writes to defend the Church of Rome, but without directly combating the *Magdeburg Centuries*. He carried the Annals as far as 1198. His continuators, the best of whom is Raynaldus, brought them down to 1586. The best edition of Baronius and of his continuators is that of A. Theiner (1864), which contains the valuable annotations (*Critica*) of Pagi.

In England, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, much historical learning was brought forward in the controversies with Rome, and between the Churchmen and Puritans. Cranmer and his contemporaries, also Ussher, Hooker, Cartwright, and many others, were laborious students of the past. But their historical writing was in connection with debates on doctrine and Church polity.

In France, the Gallican School produced important works in this department. Natalis Alexander brought the history of the Church (in 8 vols.)

down to 1600. In a more interesting style, Fleury wrote (20 vols.) his history of the Church, down to 1414—continued by Fabre to 1595—a readable work, displeasing to Ultramontanists. There is a translation of a portion of Fleury (A.D. 381–400), revised by J. H. Newman (3 vols.). The most accurate and valuable of the French ecclesiastical historians of this age is Tillemont, whose sympathies were with the Jansenists. His work relates only to the first six centuries. It is highly appreciated by Gibbon. Bossuet, in his polemical writings, and in his discourse on Universal History, dealt with important periods and events in the history of the Church. Dupin (1657–1719) wrote a copious bibliographical and biographical account of ecclesiastical writers. His liberality brought on him ecclesiastical censure. His sympathies were with the Jansenists. The similar work of Ceillier is more full and correct.

In Germany, a new epoch was introduced by Mosheim (d. 1755), Professor at Göttingen, whose History of the Church, in comparison with its predecessors, was marked by a scientific spirit, and merited the esteem which it long enjoyed as a text-book. It is the work of a thorough, conscientious scholar. It is arranged in the centurial form, is commonplace in its style, and lacks philosophical insight. The best edition in English is the American edition of Murdock, enriched by his notes. Mosheim's work on the first three centuries—the *Commentaries*, etc.—is a production of equal solidity. It was, also, edited by Murdock. Schröckh followed Mosheim in a truly learned, voluminous History of the Church (in 45 vols.). He forsakes the centurial method for a less formal division into periods. He may be consulted by the student with profit.

The present century in Germany has witnessed the production of works in Church history of the highest value. Among many authors of note, the three most eminent are Neander, Gieseler, and Baur. Their works, and the writings of other recent German authors in this department, both Protestant and Catholic, will be described. In France, England, and America, there have been important contributions to the literature of this branch of study, which will be characterized in the lists that follow.

THE MOST IMPORTANT RECENT WORKS.

Neander's Church History (Torrey's translation, 5 vols., with an index volume). Neander wrote, also, a *Life of Jesus*, and a *History of the Planting and Training of the Apostolic Church*, which will be characterized later. His Church History is the fruit of thorough learning, and is pervaded by a spirit of piety, deep and earnest, and, at the same time, truly catholic. This work is equally instructive and, in the best sense of the term, edifying. Neander is especially strong in the departments of theological doctrine and of Christian life, and in the analysis of character; in a word, as regards the inner springs and movement of history. The narrative lacks color, and the external aspects of the subject are neglected. On the whole, Neander's History is one of the noblest historical productions of the present age.

Gieseler's Church History (Professor H. B. Smith's edition, 5 vols.) is marked by a high ethical tone, without the evangelical warmth which is a leading trait of Neander. The text of Gieseler is comparatively brief. He is clear in his statements, impartial, and exceptionally accurate. The volumes are largely made up of references and excerpts in marginal notes, in which the vast learning of the author is instructively exhibited. The work is a li

brary in itself. It is fully appreciated by the best students of general history.

Baur's strength was given mainly to the study of the historical foundations of Christianity, and to the first three centuries. But he discusses, with striking ability and perspicuity, the later periods especially doctrinal history. The influence of the Hegelian philosophy is manifest everywhere. Baur's peculiar theory as to the conflicts in the Apostolic age, and their effect in the production of the books of the New Testament Canon, and in developing the old Catholic Church, must not be forgotten. His Church History embraces five volumes.

Among later works in this department, the Church History of Dr. Schaff merits particular commendation. It is founded on a study of the original sources. Its author is familiar with the English and American, as well as the continental literature. Its tone is at once evangelical and liberal. The bibliography which it furnishes is very full and valuable. The work has the signal advantage of taking into view the investigations of scholars down to the present date.

Hagenbach's *History of the Church* (7 vols.) is adapted to cultivated readers. There is an English translation of the portion treating of the History of the Reformation (2 vols., Edinburgh, 1879).

In connection with these general works, the writings of Milman may properly be referred to. His *History of the Jews* and his *History of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* are of moderate value. His principal work is the *History of Latin Christianity* (8 vols.), which extends to the middle of the fifteenth century. More than most of the Church historians, he writes for the literary class. It is a useful complement of Neander. The learning is ample, the style is animated, but with a predilection for the Latin element. On the papacy in the Middle Ages, and on the topics connected with literature and art, Milman is both entertaining and instructive.

Robertson's *History of the Church* (revised ed., 8 vols., 1874) extends to the Reformation. The author, a Canon in the English Episcopal Church, is a well-informed scholar, and writes in a moderate and candid spirit.

Professor Henry B. Smith's *History of the Church in Chronological Tables*, includes a vast amount of classified information, with penetrating comments. Respecting American Ecclesiastical History, there is a very valuable collection of facts and dates.

In a popular style—Böhringer's *Kirchengeschichte in Biographien* (12 vols., 2d ed., 1861 sqq.).

Of the smaller manuals of Church History, one of the most important is that of Hase (11th ed., 1886; the American translation, from 7th ed., 1854). It is a condensed narrative of a thorough scholar, written in a pithy and sometimes racy style. Its chief defect is owing to an undue compression—in the room of a selection—of the matter. Hase has begun the publication of a Church History of a more popular character, on the basis of his lectures (vol. i., 1885).

Kurtz's Church History (2 vols., 10th ed., 1887; the American translation, from an earlier ed.) is more distinctly religious than Hase's work. Its author writes in sympathy with the Lutheran creed. The facts are clearly presented and well arranged. It is an excellent work.

Niedner's Manual (1 vol., last ed., 1866) was the result of original and thorough researches; it includes in every period fresh views of the subject, but

is "schematized" to excess—broken up into sections and sub-sections—and, generally speaking, is clumsy in its literary execution. The philosophical suggestions incorporated in the narrative are often striking, but reflect in a marked way the author's individuality.

The "Student's Church History" (in Smith's series of text-books) extends to the Reformation (with a brief view of that era). It is based largely on Schaff's Church History. Guericke's History is the production of a strict Lutheran. It is drawn, however, in great part from Neander. Professor Shedd's translation extends as far as A.D. 1073.

Other German manuals (by Protestants) are Herzog's *Abriss* (3 vols.), H. Schmid (2 vols., 1881), Jacobi (the first six centuries). Rothe's *Kirchengesch.*—a posthumous work—is incomplete. It contains interesting theoretical views.

One of the best of the Roman Catholic manuals is the Church History of Alzog (2 vols., 9th ed., 1878); American translation in 3 vols. (Cincinnati, 1874). But the translation involves a considerable number of changes, which comprise not only additions but omissions and other departures from the text. Some of these alterations no Protestant would consider improvements.

Another Roman Catholic manual (ultramontane) is that of Hergenröther (3d ed., 2 vols., 1885). Ritter's work is also valuable (6th ed., 1862, 2 vols.). Funk's, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.* (folio, 1886), is moderate in its judgments. Kraus, *Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch.*, is thorough and liberal.

Döllinger's *Handbook of Christian Church History* (2 vols.) comes down to A.D. 680, and his *Manual of Church History* to the fifteenth century, and in part to 1517. Cox's English translation of Döllinger (4 vols., 1840–1842) is from both works as far as they cover different ground.

Besides the works mentioned above, the dictionaries and encyclopædias referred to on page 670f are of great service.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.

Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, 5th ed., 1867. The English translation, enriched by additions by Professor H. B. Smith (2 vols., 1861). Hagenbach is fair-minded. The work is rather a conglomerate of statements and references than a connected exposition. Baur's *Vorlesungen über christl. Dogmengesch.* (3 vols., 1865–1867), although moulded according to the author's historical and philosophical theory, is highly instructive. Neander's posthumous *Dogmengesch.* (2 vols., 1857, translated in Bohn's Library) is a welcome supplement to the chapters on the subject in his Church History. The statements on the later periods are brief but suggestive. Gieseler's posthumous *Dogmengesch.* (edited by Redepenning) is a valuable sketch. It terminates at the Reformation. Shedd's *History of Doctrine* (2 vols.) is a vigorous treatise by an able theologian of the Calvinistic school. Sheldon's *History of Doctrine* (2 vols., 1886) is by a Methodist author, who writes with impartiality. One of the best of the histories of doctrine is the *Compendium d. Dogmengeschichte*, by Baumgarten-Crusius (2 vols., 1840). Münscher's *Dogmengesch.* (edited by Von Cölln, 3d ed., 1832–1834) contains copious citations from the sources. Schmid's *Dogmengesch.* (1 vol., 4th ed., by Hauck, 1887) is a meritorious work. The *Dogmengesch.* of Thomasius (2d ed., 1886) is very valuable. A. Harnack's *Dogmengesch.* embraces (thus far) the first three centuries, and the Trinitarian and Christological controversies of the East in the next period.

MONOGRAPHS.—One of the principal monographs is Dorner's *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (2d ed., 1845), translated in Clark's Foreign Library. Other works under this head are Baur's *History of the Doctrine of the Atonement*; Oxenham (Rom. Cath.), *Catholic Doctrine of the Atonement*; Baur's *History of the Doctrine of the Trinity*; Meier's *History of the Doctrine of the Trinity*; Ritschl's *History of the Doctrine of Justification* (translated); Luthardt's *History of the Doctrine of Free-will and Grace*; Höfling's *History of the Sacrament of Baptism*; Ebrard's *History of the Dogma of the Lord's Supper*; Alger's *History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*. To Alger's work is annexed a very copious and accurate bibliography of the subject, by Ezra Abbot. Jul. Müller's *Christ. Doctr. of Sin* (2 vols., Edinb., 1868) contains much historical matter.

On the *History of Heresies*, Walch's *Ketzergeschichte* (down to the Reformation, 11 vols., Leipsic, 1762 sqq.) is a storehouse of learning on the subject.

THE SOURCES OF CHURCH HISTORY.

The Sources of Church History, and other works relating to the topic, are given in many of the ecclesiastical histories, as Gieseler, Kurtz, Alzog. Of special value are the classified lists in Schaff's Church History. In addition to the titles of books, Schaff gives many references to articles in Dictionaries and Reviews. With the exception of English works, the lists are quite full (with abbreviated titles) in Hase (11th ed., 1886; the English translation, from the 7th ed., Jena, 1854). The student may also be referred to the Literature as given in the *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology* of Crooks and Hurst (based on Hagenbach), and to Zöckler's *Theologisch. Encycl.*, vol. ii.; also to the several articles in Herzog and Plitt's *Real. Encycl. d. Theol. u. Kirche*. The Schaff-Herzog *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge* (3 vols.) presents much additional information in Bibliography. The same is true of Smith and Wace's *Dictionary of Christ. Biography* [to the age of Charlemagne] (4 vols.); of Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities* (2 vols.); of the Roman Catholic *Kirchenlexicon* (ed. 2, 1880 sq.); of Kraus's *Real. Encycl. d. Christl. Alterthümer*; and of McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* (10 vols., 1867-1881, with 2 supplementary vols., to 1887). Some references to authorities are given by J. H. Blunt (High Church Episcopalian), *Dictionary of Sects, Heresies, etc.*, (1 vol. 1886). Articles in the last edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* often give references to authorities. For articles in Reviews and Magazines on religious or ecclesiastical subjects, see Poole's *Index*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE SOURCES.—Fabricius has been called "the prince of bibliographers." Of special value is his *Biblioth. Græca* (ed. Harles, 12 vols., 1790-1809). The *Lexicon* of Suidas, a Greek writer in the tenth century, combines the character of a dictionary and of an encyclopædia. It contains many quotations; is instructive, although uncritical. Editions by Bernhardt, by Gaisford; also by Imm. Bekker (1854). Potthast's *Bibl. Hist. Med. Aevi* (375-1500) (Berlin, 1852, 1 vol., with Suppl., 1 vol.) is an excellent catalogue of mediæval historical writers, to which is added lists of Saints, with their festal days, a list of the Popes and a list of German bishops.

WORKS ON THE ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS.—Dupin, *Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs Eccl.* (1636-1714, 47 vols.); Continuation, for Protestant writers

of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (1718–21); Continuation, by Gouget, for writers of the eighteenth century (1736, 3 vols.). Of higher merit is Ceillier's *Hist. générale des auteurs sacrés et eccl.* (1729–63, 23 vols.). Cave: *Scriptorum Eccl. Hist. Literaria* (2 vols., 1688). Cave was learned, but uncritical. Ebert's *Allg. Gesch. d. Lit. des Mittelalters im Abendlande* (3 vols., 1874: the first volume treats of the ancient Latin Fathers). Alzog (Rom. Cath.), *Handbuch d. Patrologie* (1876).

COLLECTIONS OF ECCLESIASTICAL WRITERS.—*Maxima Bibliotheca vett. patrum* (Lugd., 1677, 27 vols. fol.). In this edition the Greek Fathers are only in Latin translations.

A. Gallandi, *Bibl. vett. patrum*, etc. (Ven., 1765–88, 14 vols.). It contains 380 writers, with notes and dissertations; the Greek authors with Latin translations.

Abbé Migne, *Patrologiæ cursus completus*. Includes the writers down to the thirteenth century—223 Latin, 167 Greek. The authors are reprinted from the Benedictine and other good editions—the Benedictine editions being specially valuable. The dissertations, prologomena, etc. of Migne's edition, as well as his Theological Dictionaries, connected with the series, are useful. The printing is not always accurate. Migne's edition is very convenient; it comprises the minor as well as the more important writers.

Other important collections: D'Achery's *Spicilegium* (3 vols.); Baluze, *Miscellanea* (ed. Mansi, 1678); the collections of Martene et Durand (9 vols., 1724), of Basnage (4 vols., 1725), of Mai (Rome, 1825 sqq.).

Of special value are critical editions of particular writers—as the *Corpus Script. ecclesiasticorum* (Vienna, 1866 sqq., 16 vols. have appeared); the editions of the Apostolic Fathers, by Hefele; by Gebhardt, Harnack and Zahn; Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp, by Lightfoot; Barnabas, by Müller; The teaching of the XII. Apostles, by A. Harnack, by P. Schaef, by Hitchcock and Brown, by Sabatier, by Dr. C. Taylor, R. Harris, etc.; Justin, by Otto; Ep. ad Diognet., by Otto; Irenæus, by Stieren, by Harvey; Tertullian, by Oehler (in *Corpus Hæresiol.*); Clement of Alexandria, by Potter; Origen, by Redepenning; Epiphanius, by Oehler; Eusebius, by Heinichen (1827, 3 vols.).

There are numerous monographs, mostly in German, on the Fathers. Translations of the Ante-Nicene Fathers (24 vols., Edinburgh); reprinted in America (edited by Bishop Coxe). The Post-Nicene Fathers (containing the most important writings). This series is edited by Schaff: the translations mostly taken from the Oxford Library of the Fathers. Early Christian Literature *Primers* (by George A. Jackson): accounts of the Fathers with large extracts. *The Fathers for English Readers*, containing lives of Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose, Leo, etc.

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS BY CONTEMPORARY WRITERS.—The Byzantine Historians, edition Niebuhr, 48 vols. For an account of these historians, see the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Muratori, *Rerum Italia Scriptores*, from 500 to 1500 (1723–1751, 25 vols.). Uniform editions of Muratori's works, Venice, 1790–1810 (48 vols.). Pertz, *Monumenta Germaniæ hist.* (500–1500), 1826 sqq.; continued by Waitz.

ACTS OF COUNCILS.—These are given in the great Collections of Hardouin (12 vols., Paris, 1715), and Mansi (31 vols., Flor. et Ven., 1759 sqq.). Had-

dan and Stubbs, *Councils and Ecclesiastical Documents relating to Great Britain and Ireland*, etc. (1869 sqq.). Hartzheim, *Concill. Germaniæ* (1740 sqq.). Of the histories of Councils, one of the most important is that of Hefele (Roman Catholic): translated. Eight vols. have appeared in the German; the 8th vol. being by Hergenröther (1887). It extends to the time between the Council of Basle and the 5th Lateran Council. A. W. W. Dale, *The Synod of Elvira*, etc. (1 vol., London, 1882).

BULLS AND BRIEFS OF POPES.—The “Bulls” have pendent seals of lead; the briefs (which are generally on matters of less moment) are sealed with wax. The first comprehensive collection was the Bullarium, edited by Cherubini (4th ed., 5 vols., 1672). More complete collections are those printed at Luxemburg (1727–1758, 19 vols.), and at Rome (1733–1748, 14 vols.). This last in Tomasetti's edition (from A.D. 440), in 24 vols., Turin, 1857–1872; Barbieri's “Continuation” (18 vols., 1835–1857). There are Bullaria for single popes, for separate orders, etc.

ABSTRACTS OF PAPAL DOCUMENTS in the *Regesta*.—Jaffé, *Regesta Pontiff. Rom.* (to 1198); A. Potthast, *Regesta Pontiff. Rom.* (1198–1304). There are other works of this class for particular papal reigns.

LITURGIES.—Assemanus, *Codex liturg. Eccl. univ.* (13 vols., unfinished, Rome, 1749–66); Daniel, *Codex liturg. Eccl. univ. in epitomen redactus* (4 vols., 1847–55); Daniel, *Thesaurus Hymnologicus* (5 vols., 1851–56). *Liturgies and other Documents of the Ante-Nicene Period* (1 vol., Edinburgh, 1872).

CREEDS.—Walch, *Biblioth. symbol. vetus* (1770); Streitwolf et Kleiner, *Symbols of the Roman Catholic Church*; Hase, *The Lutheran Symbols*; Jacobs, *The Book of Concord* (a collection of Lutheran Creeds, in English, with Notes), 1882; Niemeyer, *Symbols of the Reformed Churches*; Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom*, with full and instructive introductions and notes (3 vols.).

AUXILIARY STUDIES.

GENERAL HISTORY.—The bibliography is given in Fisher's *Outlines of Universal History*, Adams's *Manual of Hist. Lit.*; select bibliography, in Andrews's *Institutes of History*. Copious works on Universal History by Weber, Schlosser, Ranke (incomplete), etc. Historical Works in Oncken's series (German). Laurent's *Études sur l'hist. de l'Humanité* are historical dissertations in a series of vols.—instructive, although rationalistic in their views of Christianity. Ancient History, especially Oriental, is well presented by Duncker—*History of Antiquity* (6 vols.). For the History of Greece, Grote and the briefer work of Curtius, also Thirlwall, may be studied. Duncker's *History of Greece* (2 vols.) follows his six vols. on Oriental History. For the History of Rome there are brief comprehensive works by Merivale, and by Liddell. For the Roman Republic, Mommsen; for the Empire, Merivale's *History of the Emperors*; for the dissolution of the Empire, Gibbon—also, an abridgment of Gibbon, “*The Student's Gibbon*” (1 vol.). Smith's ed. of Gibbon (8 vols, 1854.) contains the notes of Guizot and Milman. Other valuable works: Ihne, *History of Rome*, 5 vols. (London, 1871); Duruy, *History of Rome to the establishment of the Christian Empire*, 6 vols. (1854); an illustrated work. In the series of “*Epoch Histories*,” 17 vols., are included Capes, *The Early Empire, from Cæsar to Domitian*, and *The Roman Empire*

of the 2d Century; Church, *The Beginning of the Middle Ages*; Seebohm, *The Protestant Reformation*; Cox, *The Crusades*, etc.; Hodgkin, *Italy and her Invaders* (4 vols., the 4th in 1885); Sheppard, *Fall of Rome, and Rise of New Nationalities*.

For the Middle Ages—besides the general histories—Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* (1 vol.); Hallam's *Middle Ages*, and his *Literature of Europe*; Duruy's *History of the Middle Ages* (1 vol., in French); Guizot's *Lectures on the History of Civilization*.

HISTORIES OF THE SEVERAL COUNTRIES.—History of France, by Crowe (5 vols.), by Martin, by Guizot (a popular history, 6 vols.), by Kitchin, by Jervis (Student's History, 1 vol.), by Jules Michelet (2 vols.). History of England, by Green (4 vols.). History of Scotland, by Burton. History of Germany, by C. T. Lewis (founded on Müller). Excellent histories of Germany by Kaufman (to Charlemagne), 1880–81, and by K. W. Nitzsch, vol. i., 1883. On the Migrations, two works of high authority are by Wietersheim, *Völkerowanderung*, and Dahn, *Die Könige d. Germanen*, etc. (1861–71). History of Russia, by Rambaud (2 vols., 1879). History of the United States, by Bancroft; by Winsor; Doyle's *American Colonies* (3 vols., 1st vol., 1882; 2d and 3d, 1887); Lodge's *Short History of the American Colonies* (1 vol.).

GEOGRAPHY.—The best historical maps are in the great work of Spruner (Menke's edition). There is a smaller excellent collection by Droysen. A good collection, much smaller still, is that of Putzger. The best Ancient Atlas is Kiepert's (1 vol.). Labberton, *New Hist. Atlas and Gen. History* (with outline maps). Freeman's *Historical Geography of Europe* (vol. i., text; vol. ii., maps), is very useful.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY.—Ueberweg, 2 vols., translated by Morris, with additions by Porter. Ueberweg gives the bibliography in full. Zeller's History of Greek Philosophy is the best work on this subject. There is an English Translation. Ritter's *Gesch. d. Christl. Phil.* (8 vols.), begins with Gnosticism and comes down to the end of the 18th century. Ritter is learned and fair-minded. History of Modern Philosophy, by Kuno Fischer.

ECCLESIASTICAL PHILOLOGY.—Zeller's *Thesaurus* (Greek). Sophocles' Lexicon of Byzantine Greek. Du Cange's Glossary (for Mediæval Greek). Du Cange's Glossary (for Mediæval Latin). Dictionary of Mediæval Latin, by Maigne d'Arnis, in Migne's series.

STATE OF THE WORLD AT THE COMING OF CHRIST.

Introductions to the works on Church History. Döllinger, *Heidenthum u. Judenthum*; English translation, "*The Gentile and the Jew*," etc. (2 vols.). It contains much information, but in some parts—e.g., facts illustrative of heathen morals—needs to be critically sifted. Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* (1875)—good up to its date. Hausrath, *N. T. Zeitgesch.*; an English translation. It takes rationalistic views of Christianity. Schürer, *Gesch. d. Jüdisch. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Only the second volume published (2d ed., 1886), relating to the Jewish people; a work of thorough scholarship, very full and accurate: translated. The first edition (published as complete) was called *N. T. Zeitgesch.* (1874). Holtzmann, *Judenthum u. Christenthum* (in N. T. times), 1 vol., 1867. Weber's *System d. altsynagogalen Theol.* (1 vol.,

1880) is highly instructive. Friedländer, *Sittengesch. Roms* (3 vols.); a detailed, interesting, accurate account of morals, manners, etc.: a work of authority. Fisher's *Beginnings of Christianity*: it includes a survey of heathenism and Judaism. Uhlhorn's *The Conflict of Christianity with Heathenism*: translated by E. C. Smyth and C. J. H. Ropes: fresh, compact, instructive. The notes by author and editors are of much value to students. They contain numerous references to other books.

ON JUDAISM.—The Old Testament Apocrypha; commentary on it by E. C. Bissell. Josephus; his *Antiquities* (written with a view to commend Judaism to the Gentiles); useful for the period after the exile. *The Jewish War* (in which he took part). Editions of Josephus, by Havercamp and Dindorf. *Antiquities*, translated by Whiston; *The Jewish War*, translated well by Traill. The passage in Josephus relative to Christ is probably spurious; if not, is interpolated. See the discussion in Schürer's work, before referred to. On Alexandrian Judaism: The writings of Philo (Mangey's ed., translated by Yonge). Siegfried's *Philo von Alex.* (1875) is a standard work. Histories of the Jews: Ewald's History—translated into English—learned, original, eloquent, but often eccentric, and rash in conjecture. Stanley's *Lectures*, etc. (3 vols.), based mainly on Ewald—graphic, with high literary merit. The histories by Hengstenberg and by Kurtz (translated), are from the conservative orthodox point of view. The histories by Wellhausen (vol. i.), and by Kuenen, critical and radical. Article by Wellhausen in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Jewish writers—Jost, Geiger, Herzfeld, Grätz—have written learned histories of Judaism.

ON HEATHENISM.—Nägelsbach's works, *Homerische Theologie* and *Nach-homerische Theologie*. Wuttke, *Gesch. d. Heidenthums in Beziehung auf Religion*, etc. (2 vols.). Maurice, *The Religions of the World in their Relation to Christianity*; Hulsean Lectures for 1845-46. B. F. Cocker, *Christianity and Greek Philosophy*, etc. Denis, *Hist. des Théories et des Idées morales dans l'Antiquité*. Boissier, *The Roman Religion, from Augustus to the Antonines* (in French). Neander, *The Relation of Grecian to Christian Ethics*, in "Wissenschaftl. Abhandl."—transl. in *Bib. Sacra*, vol. x. *St. Paul and Seneca*—in Lightfoot's "Philippians." The histories of Ancient Philosophy: *History of the Greek Philosophy*, by Zeller; also—a brief excellent work (1 vol.)—Schwegler's *Gesch. d. Gr. Phil.*

THE LIFE OF JESUS.

The prime sources are the four canonical Gospels. For a brief account of the apocryphal Gospels, see Schaff's *Church History*, i., 90; Fisher's *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*, p. 206. On the apocryphal sayings of Christ, see Schaff, i., 162 sqq. Lardner's *Credibility of the Gospel History*, with the Supplement of *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, is an invaluable compilation of passages, given in the original and also in English.

Recent works on the Life of Jesus: The work of Weiss (2 vols., translated) is to be placed at the head of the list. There is a full preliminary discussion of the origin and credibility of the Gospels. Reyschlag's *Life of Jesus* (1886), is valuable. Neander's *Life of Jesus* lacks a critical introduction, but is a profound treatment of the subject, which is not superseded by later works. It was occasioned by Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, in which the mythical theory was

presented. Ewald's *History of Jesus* is suggestive: he receives the fourth Gospel as genuine. Hase's *Life of Jesus* is full in its bibliography. Keim's larger work (5 vols.) is based on the Synoptists, with the rejection of John: it is anti-supernaturalistic in its spirit, yet with striking concessions. Rénan presents the legendary theory. He deals with the Gospel narratives as if they were constructed like the lives of Francis of Assisi and other mediæval saints. He is brilliant, and not deficient in learning, but imaginative, and with a torpidity of moral feeling, having no sympathy with the holiness of the sacred authors and of the revealed system of religion. Other works on the Life of Christ, by Pressensé, Ellicott (*Historical Lectures*), S. J. Andrews, Farrar (2 vols.), Geikie (2 vols.), Edersheim (2 vols., 1886).

THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

Neander's *History of the Planting and Training of the Church* (Robinson's edition) retains its high value. Stanley's *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age* is, perhaps, the best of his writings. Lechler's *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Age* (3d edition, recomposed, 1885), is a compact, judicious treatise. It incidentally answers Baur. Baur's theories are given in his *History of the First Three Centuries*, and in his *Apostle Paul*. Both works are translated. Ritschl's *Entstehung d. altkatholischen Kirche*, in the 2d edition (1857), opposes leading positions of Baur. Ewald's sixth volume, relating to this period, is independent in its tone, but against the Tübingen critics. "Supernatural Religion" is an English work, advocating the Tübingen views. It is confuted by Bishop Lightfoot, in the Cont. Rev., 1875-77; also, by Sanday, in "The Gospels in the Second Century." In opposition to Baur, Strauss, and Rénan: Fisher's *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity* (new edition, 1877). De Pressensé: Volume i. of his *Hist. des trois premiers siècles de l'Église chrétienne*, English translation, new edition, 1879 (*The Apostolic Era*).

THE PERSECUTION OF NERO.—(Passages from Suetonius and Tacitus, in Lardner.) H. Schiller, *Gesch. d. rom. Kaiserzeit unter der Regierung d. Nero*. Keim, *Aus dem Urchristenthum* (1878) and *Rom u. das Christenthum* (1881). Rénan, *L'Antechrist*, one of the volumes in his *Hist. des origines du Christianisme*, and one of the most brilliant of them. Mommsen's volume (vi.) on the *Roman Provinces* (translated). Hochart, *Études au sujet d. persécutions d. Chrétiens sous Néron* (1885). The Commentaries on the Apocalypse: Düsterdieck (in Meyer), etc.

THE APOSTLE PAUL.—Baur's *Life of Paul* represents the views of the Tübingen School, which holds to the theory of an antagonism with the "pillar Apostles." There are two elaborate and copious biographies of Paul in English, each valuable; Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of Paul*; also, an abridgment of the same in one volume; and Lewin, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of the Apostle Paul* (1 vol.) is an original, highly valuable work. Farrar's *Life and Work of St. Paul* (2 vols.) is a scholarly work, in an animated style. Rénan's *Saint Paul*—full of vivacity, with numerous unverified assertions and conjectures. O. Pfleiderer's *Das Urchristenthum* is moderately rationalistic. Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* is a comparison of the Acts with the Pauline Epistles, proving the credibility of the history. The doctrine of Paul is set forth in the works on Biblical Theology: Weiss, Schmid, etc.; also, in special works from different

points of view: e.g., Pfeleiderer, *Paulinismus*; Sabatier, *L'apôtre Paul: Esquisse d'une histoire de sa pensée*. The best commentaries on Paul's writings, as those of Meyer, Weiss's Meyer, Lightfoot, enter into historical questions. See, especially, Lightfoot's excursus on "St. Paul and the Three," in his "Philippians."

THE ORGANIZATION OF THE CHURCH.—(For a list of older writers on this subject, Hooker, Cartwright, etc., see Schaff, i., 481.) J. B. Lightfoot, the *Christian Ministry* (in his "Philippians")—reprinted separately. G. A. Jacob, *Eccl. Polity of the N. T.* (Episcopalian, Low Church). W. Palmer, *A Treatise on the Church of England* (Am. ed., with notes by Bp. Whittingham—Episcopalian, High Church). Bp. Wordsworth, *Outlines of the Christian Ministry* (High Ch., Episcopalian). Hodge's *Essays on the Primitive Ch. Officers, and Discussions on Ch. Polity* (Presbyterian). The works (by Congregationalists) of S. Davidson, *The Eccl. Polity of the N. T.*; Wardlaw, *Congl. Independence*, and H. M. Dexter, *Congregationalism*. E. Hatch (Episcopalian), *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches*. Hatch presents new views as to the influence of secular societies in shaping Church organization, and of the financial work of the bishop in developing Episcopacy. See, also, A. Harnack's notes on his German transl. of Hatch. Harnack adopts the view that in the Gentile churches the officers were at first bishops and deacons, and that presbyters were first for *internal* administration. Bishops and presbyters were combined; the monarchical episcopate was developed out of the presbytery thus enlarged. Similar views—in A. Harnack's ed. of *The Teaching of the XII. Apostles*; Weizsäcker, *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, etc. See, also, on this subject, the recent commentaries on the Pastoral Epistles. Otto Ritschl, *Cyprian von Carthago u. d. Verfassung d. Kirche* (1885).

FROM THE APOSTOLIC AGE TO CONSTANTINE (100-313).

THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.—On this and other topics, the *Eccl. History* of Eusebius. C. Merivale, *Conversion of the Roman Empire* (1 vol.). This book, however, is mostly on the state of heathen society. A. Beugnot, *Hist. de la destruction du paganisme dans l'empire d'Occident* (1850). Chastel, *Hist. de la destruct. du paganisme en Orient* (1850). Rénan, *Marc Aurèle* 1882; the 7th vol. in his series). J. Lloyd, *The North African Church* (1880).

PERSECUTIONS.—Ruinart, *Acta primorum martyrum*, etc. (for the first four centuries). Eusebius, *Eccl. History*. Aubé, *Hist. des persécutions*, etc.—to the end of the Antonines (1875); also, *Hist. des persécutions*, etc.—to the end of the 2d century (1878). Wieseler, *Die Christenverfolg. d. Cäsar. bis zum dritten Jhd.* (1878). Fox's *Acts and Monuments of the Church* (or "Book of Martyrs," Townsend's ed., 1843, 8 vols.). The 1st vol. is on "the ten Roman Persecutions." Fox is of special interest in connection with the later history of Protestant martyrs, in particular in England. He is honest, somewhat credulous, sometimes inaccurate in details. De Pressensé, *The Martyrs and Apologists* (N. Y., 1871). A. J. Mason, *The Persecution of Diocletian* (1876). On the relation of Church and State in the first three centuries: Doucet, *Essai sur les Rapports de l'Eglise chrét. avec l'État romain* (1 vol., 1883); a good discussion.

CHRISTIAN ART.—Fergusson's *Hist. of Architecture*. Histories of Art, by Kugler, Lübke, Viollet le Duc. Dehniö u. von Bezold, *Die kirchliche Baukunst d. Abendl.* (1884). It derives the basilica from the private house. On the other side, Lange, *Haus u. Halle* etc. (1885). G. Baldwin Brown, *From School to Cathedral* (Edinb., 1886). Kraus (Rom. Cath.) *Realencycl. d. christl. Alterthums* (2 vols., 1886). The series of works by Mrs. A. Jameson on Christian Art in ancient and mediæval times—*Sacred and Legendary Art, Legends of the Madonna*, etc., are, both for the text and illustrations, of much value.

THE CATACOMBS.—De Rossi, *La Roma Sotteranea Christiana*, etc. A voluminous work by the most distinguished explorer and student of these burying-places. Northcote and Brownlow, *Roma Sotteranea* (2 vols., 1879), based on De Rossi, with additional engravings. Theoph. Roller, *Les Catacombes de Rome* (2 vols., folio). Roller is a Protestant. J. H. Parker, *The Archæology of Rome* (Part XII., The Catacombs; Parts IX. and X., Tombs near Rome): a work of authority. V. Schultze, *Archæol. Studien über altchristl. Monumente* (1880): *Die Katakomben*, etc. (1882). On the Inscriptions, De Rossi is the principal authority: *Inscriptt. Christianæ*, etc. Northcote's *Epitaphs of the Catacombs*, etc., is a brief work.

CHRISTIAN CHARITY.—Chastel's *Charity of the Primitive Churches* (1857), from the French, is a good book. Uhlhorn's *Christian Charity in the Ancient Church* (1883) is, also, an excellent work, from the German. C. Schmidt, *Essai historique*, etc. (1853). Lecky's *Hist. of European Morals* (2 vols.).

ASCETICISM.—Zückler's *Kritische Gesch. d. Askese* (1 vol., 1863). Weingarten, *Ueber den Ursprung des Mönchthums*, etc., and his Art. in Herzog, vol. x. A. Harnack, *Das Mönchthum*, etc., (1882).

On the Celibacy of the Clergy: The history by J. A. and A. Theiner, liberal Roman Catholics: *Die Einführung der erzwungenen Ehelosigkeit*, etc. (2 vols.). H. C. Lea's, *An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, etc. (1867); full and impartial. Other references in Schaff, ii., 403.

MONTANISM.—The writings of Tertullian (index). Bonwetsch: *Die Gesch. d. Montanismus* (1881). Cunningham, *The Churches of Asia* (1880). Mossman, *Hist. of the Early Christ. Ch.* (1873). Möller's Art. in Herzog, vol. x. Art. by Salmond, in Smith and Wace.

GNOSTICISM.—On the Sources we have Lipsius, *Die Quellen d. ältesten Ketzer-gesch.* (1875), and A. Harnack, *Zur Quellen-Kritik d. Gesch. d. Gnosticismus*. Lipsius is, also, the author of a *Hist. of Gnosticism* (1860). Matter's work still has value, but needs much correction. Baur's work (1835) was able, and excited much discussion. H. L. Mansel, *The Gnostic Heresies* (1 vol., 1875), edited by J. B. Lightfoot. Lightfoot, *The Colossian Heresy* (in his "Colossians") 1875. It relates to the germs of Gnosticism in the apostolic age. Gnosticism is discussed by Rénan, in his *L'Église chrétienne* (cc. ix. and x.). Uhlhorn, *Das Basilidianische System* (1855). On Marcion's Gospel and Luke: Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (1876). Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (1881).

THE MANICHÆANS.—K. Kessler, *Untersuchung zur Genesis d. Manich. relig. Syst.*, etc. (1876); and his *Mänâ oder Beiträge zur Kenntniss*, etc. (1882); also, his Article in Herzog. A. Harnack, Article, "Manichæism," in

Encyclopædia Britannica. A. Newman, *Preface to the Anti-Manichean Writings of Augustine* (in the Library of Post-Nic. Fathers).

THE APOSTLES' CREED.—C. A. Heurtley, *Harmonia Symbolica* (Oxford, 1858). C. A. Swainson, *The Nicene and the Apostles' Creed* (London, 1875). C. P. Caspari, "*Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols u. der Glaubenregel* (Christiania, 1866–1879, 4 vols). "Contains new researches and discoveries of MSS."

THE CULTUS.—*The Observance of Sunday*: Hessey's Bampton Lectures (1860); *Sunday, its Origin, History, and Present Obligation*. R. Cox, *The Literature of the Sabbath Question* (2 vols., 1865). J. Gilfillan, *The Sabbath, viewed in the Light of Reason, Revelation, and History*, etc. (Edinburgh, 1861). Gilfillan defends the Puritan view. *Sabbath Essays* (1880; Cong. Publ. Soc.).

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.—F. Nitzsch, *Grundriss d. christl. Dogmengesch.*, 1. Th., *Die patristische Periode* (1870). J. Donaldson, *A Critical Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctr., from the Death of the Apostles to the Nicene Council* (3 vols.). De Pressensé: *Heresy and Christian Doctrine*; translated (1873); popular in style. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of the Alexandrian School*, Bampton Lectures, 1886. J. Denis, *De la Phil. d'Origène* (1884). A. V. G. Allen's *The Continuity of Christian Thought* (1 vol., 1885) contains a lucid exposition of the early Alexandrian Theology.

The Divinity of Christ: Bull's *Defensio Fidei Nicenæ*, etc.: a work of great learning. English translation in the "Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology." H. P. Liddon, *The Divinity of Our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, Bampton Lectures for 1866.

The Holy Spirit: E. Burton, *Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of the Holy Ghost*.

Redemption: Duncker, *Des heilig. Irenæus Christologie* (1843).

Eschatology: F. Weber, *System d. altsynagogalen palästinisch. Theologie*, etc. (1880). It gives the eschatology of the later Jews. It is the product of many years' study of the Rabbinical sources. Article, *Eschatology*, in *Smith and Wace's Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Farrar's *Eternal Hope* (1879). Pusey's *Reply* (2d ed., 1880), and Farrar's *Rejoinder—Mercy and Judgment*, etc.—contain much historical matter.

FROM CONSTANTINE TO GREGORY I. (313–590).

The *Chronica* of Sulpicius Severus (c. 365–c. 425), and his *Vita Martini Turen.* are good for the church life of France in his own times. A. de Broglie, *L'Eglise et l'Empire romain au IV^{me} siècle* (6 vols., 1855–66). W. Bright, *A History of the Church, from the Edict of Milan, A.D. 313, to the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451* (1860). Langen, *Gesch. d. Röm. Kirche von Leo I. to Nicholas I.* (1885), and *Gesch. d. Röm. K. zum Pontif. Leo. I.* (1881). A. P. Stanley, *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church* (1 vol.). Von Schultze, *Gesch. d. Untergangs d. Griechisch römischen Heidenthums* (vol. 1st, 1887).

ON CONSTANTINE.—The two ancient authorities are Eusebius (*Life of C.*), and, on the heathen side, Zosimus, *Hist. of the Rom. Empire*. Burckhardt, *Die Zeit. Const. d. Gr.* (1853). Keim, *Der Uebertritt Const.*, etc. (1862). On Julian, D. F. Strauss, *Der Romantiker auf dem Thron d. Cäsaren*, etc. (1847). W. Mangold, *Jul. d. Abtr.* (1862). F. Lübker, *Julian's Kampf. u. Ende* (1864). Neander's Monograph on Julian is worthy of the author.

THE HIERARCHY.—T. Greenwood, *Cathedra Petri, a Political History of the Latin Patriarchate* (1859: valuable). Hefele's *History of Councils* (8 vols.: English translation). Geffcken, *Church and State* (English translation, 2 vols., 1877). Ribbeck, *Donatus u. Augustinus*, etc. (1858). Walther, *Lehrbuch d. Kirchenrechts* (8th ed., 1839). Hatch, *The Growth of Ch. Institutions* (1 vol., 1887). Stanley's *Christ. Institutions* (3d ed., 1882); a popular work.

MONASTICISM.—Montalembert (Rom. Cath.), *Les Moines d'Occident depuis St. Benoît jusqu'à St. Bernard* (1860 sqq., 7 vols.); an eloquent, picturesque history. O. Zöckler, *Hieronymus, sein Leben u. Wirken* (1865). A. Thierry, *St. Jérôme, la Société chrétienne à Rome*, etc. (2 vols., 1867). C. Kingsley, *The Hermits* (1868): popular.

Liturgies: T. Brett, *A Collection of the Principal Liturgies*—connected with the Eucharist (English translation, 1838). W. Trollope, *The Greek Liturgy of St. James* (1848). J. M. Neale, *Tetralogia liturgica* (1849); also, the *Liturgies of S. Mark, S. James, S. Clement, S. Chrysostom, S. Basil* (Alexandria, Jerusalem, Constantinople)—the Greek originals, and the English translation in a separate volume (1859). Swainson, *The Greek Liturgies* (1 vol., 1884); a valuable work. Neale's *History of the Holy Eastern Church* (1850). Bunsen, *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. vii. Höfling, *Liturgisches Urkundebuch* (1854).

Vestments: Hefele, *Beiträge zur Kirchengesch., Archäologie u. Liturgik* (vol. ii.). Stanley's *Christian Institutions* (1 vol.). Weiss, *Kostümkunde*.

Hymns: R. Trench, *Sacred Latin Poetry*, etc. (3d ed., 1864). J. M. Neale, *The Ecclesiastical Poetry of the Middle Ages* (in Thompson's *History of Roman Literature*). J. Chandler, *The Hymns of the Primitive Church*, etc. (1837).

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.—On Arianism. Athanasius, *Discourses against the Arians* (2 vols., edited by J. H. Newman, in Oxford Library of the Fathers): *On the Incarnation*, with Notes, by A. Robertson; translation of the same (1882–84). The old works of Petavius (his *De theologicis dogmatibus*), and of Maimbourg (*Hist. de l'Arianisme*), 1675; of Bull and Waterland, English defenders of orthodoxy, and Pearson's *Exposition of the Creed*. Mühlher, *Athanasius d. Grosse u. die Kirche seiner Zeit* (2d ed., 1844). J. H. Newman, *The Arians of the Fourth Century* (2d ed., 1854). Bishop Kaye, *Athanasius and the Council of Nicæa* (1853). H. Voigt, *Die Lehre d. Athanasius*, etc. (1861). N. M. Gwatkin, *Studies of Arianism*, etc. (1884). Dorner's *History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ*, and Baur's *History of the Doctrine of the Trinity*. Full descriptive account of the Council of Nicæa, in Stanley's *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*.

The Pelagian Controversy: Wiggers's work on Augustinism and Pelagianism (translated by Emerson, 1840). Nourisson, *La philosophie de S. Augustin* (2 vols., 1866). C. Bindemann, *Der heilige Augustin* (3 vols., 1844–69). A. Dorner, *Augustin, sein theol. System u. seine religions phil. Anschauung* (1873). Gangauf, *Metaphysisch. Psychol. u. heil. Aug.* (1852). W. S. Cunningham, *S. Austin and his Place in the History of Christian Thought* (1886). W. Bright, *Select Anti-Pelagian Treatises* (in Latin), with a valuable introduction (1880). Augustin's *Anti-Pelagian Writings* (vol. v., Schaff's *Post-Nicene Fathers*, 1887). H. Reuter, *Augustinisch. Studien* (1887).

THE MIDDLE AGES.

As a guide to the documentary literature—Potthast, with the supplement *The Sources*: the Byzantine Histories; Migne's *Patrology* (with Horay's Continuation); Pertz's *Monumenta* (with Waitz's Continuation); Mansi's *Councils*; the *Bullaria*; the *Acta Sanctorum*, etc. *Archiv. für Lit. u. Kirchengesch.*, by Demfle u. Ehrle (Roman Cath. scholars; two vols. have appeared).

Hardwick's *History of the Church in the Middle Ages* (1 vol., 1883, ed. Stubbs); full references to the authorities. Trench's *Lectures on Mediæval Church History* (1 vol., 1877); interesting sketches and comments. Ch. Schmidt, *Précis de l'Église pendant le Moyen-âge* (1 vol., 1886). W. Stubbs, *Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern Hist.* (1886). This work contains valuable essays on the history of the canon law in England.

Macleary's *Apostles of Mediæval Europe* (1869). T. Smith's *Mediæval Missions* (Edinb., 1880). Adamnan, *Life of St. Columba* (1874) (in *The Historians of Scotland*, vol. v.: contains a vivid representation of early Irish monasticism).

W. Krafft, *Kirchengesch. d. germ. Völker* (1854). *Conversion of the West*: Celts, English, Northmen, Slavs, by G. F. Maclear; the Continental Teutons, by C. Merivale (5 vols.; popular). Waitz, *Ueber das Leben u. die Lehre d. Ulfila* (1840). Hauck, *Kirchengesch. Deutschl.* (vol. i., 1887, to the death of Boniface).

A. Thierry, *Récits des Temps Mérovingiens* (2 vols., 1842). Münter, *Kirchengesch. von Dänemark u. Norwegen* (3 vols., 1822–33). G. F. Maclear, *The Conversion of the Northmen*, 1879. Killen, *Ecc. Hist. of Ireland* (2 vols., 1875).

MOHAMMEDANISM.—Muir's *Life of Mohammed* (4 vols.) is a learned and impartial work. The *Life of Mohammed*, by A. Springer (in German), is based on original sources and is highly valuable. T. Nöldeke, *Das Leben Mohammeds* (1863). R. Bosworth Smith, *Mohammed and Mohammedanism* (1874). *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Article by Wellhausen. Krehl, *Leben d. Muhammed* (1 vol., 1884). The *Koran*, translated by E. H. Palmer, (Oxford, 1880).

THE CONFLICT OF THE EASTERN AND WESTERN CHURCHES.—Hergenröther, *Photius, Patriarch von Constantinopel*, etc. (3 vols.). The author is a Roman Catholic. E. S. Foulkes (Anglican), *An Historical Account of the Addition of the Word Filioque to the Creed of the West* (1867).

CHRISTIAN LIFE.—Neander, *Memorials of Christian Life* (2 vols.). The *State of Religion and Morals*: Lecky's *History of European Morals from Augustus to Charlemagne*. Henry C. Lea, *Superstition and Force* [the *Wager of Law*, the *Wager of Battle*, the *Ordeal*, *Torture*] (1 vol.). Brace, *Gesta Christi* (1 vol.). Lecky's *Hist. of Rationalism* (2 vols., 1866). It contains chapters on Religious Persecution, Magic and Witchcraft, etc.: an interesting collection of facts, with reasonings on the causes of progress, which are open to criticism. P. Lacroix, *Manners, Customs, and Dress of the Middle Ages and during the Renaissance Period* (from the French). Uhlhorn, *Christian Charity in the Middle Ages*, an excellent treatise. H. C. Lea, *Studies in*

Church History (1 vol.), including "The Rise of the Temporal Power," "Benefit of Clergy," "Excommunication." Maitland's *The Dark Ages* (1 vol., 3d ed., 1853). Maitland's book, by a High Anglican, is a (somewhat exaggerated) attack on assailants of mediæval Church life, and contains interesting historical discussions. Montalembert's *History of the Monks*, etc. (see p. 670o).

HYMNS.—The Latin Hymns, *Hymni Ecclesiæ* (J. H. Newman), new edition, 1865—from the Breviary; Wackernagel, *Das deutsche Kirchenlied*, etc. (5 vols.); F. A. March, *Latin Hymns with English Notes* (N. Y., 1874); E. Caswall, *Lyra Catholica* (excellent translations); J. M. Neale, *Mediæval Hymns* (3d ed., 1867); P. Schaff, *Christ in Song*—a large collection, embracing seventy-three Latin hymns, translated.

FROM A.D. 590–1073.

MISSIONS.—On Boniface. Unfavorable to his influence (in relation to the earlier British missionaries) is Ebrard (*Die irrschott. Missionskirche*, etc., 1873, and *Bonifat., der Zerstörer*, etc., 1882). More impartial views in Rettberg, *Kg. Deutschl.*, i.; A. Werner, *Bonif., der Ap. d. Deutschen* (1881).

Ansgar: Biographies by Tappehorn (1863), Lentz (1865); R. Foss, *Die Anfänge der nordl. Miss.*, etc. (1882).

The Bohemians and Moravians: Biographies of Cyrill and Methodius by Philaret (1847), Ginzler (1857). Palacky, *Böhm. Gesch.*, i.

ON CHARLEMAGNE. The sources, in Pertz and in Waitz, *Deutsche Verfassungsgesch.* (iii., iv.); Einhard's *Life of Charl.*; Mullinger, *The Schools of Charles the Great* (1 vol., 1877).

THE POPES AND THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.—Bryce's *Holy Roman Empire* (1 vol.) is an admirable exposition of the idea of the Empire in its relation to the Church, and of the epochs in the contest. Ranke's *History of the Popes* (Intr.). The histories of Rome by Gregorovius and by Von Reumont—both copious works and of great value. Von Reumont is a moderate Roman Catholic. Gfrörer, *Greg. VII. u. seine Zeit* (7 vols.). Villemain, *Life of Gregory VII.*

The Papal State: The works on its history by Sugenheim (1851), and Niehues (1863). Also, Martens, *Die röm. Frage unter Pippin und Karl d. G.* (1881), with the Sequel, *Neue Erörterungen*, etc. (1882). Martens is a Roman Catholic, but with a critical spirit.

ART AND THE CULTUS.—F. Piper, *Einl. in d. monumental. Theol.* (1869). Zöckler, *Kreuz Christi*. E. Fuster, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Baukunst* (1874). G. Scott, *Lectures on the Rise and Development of Mediæval Architecture* (1879). G. Scott, *Essay on the Development of English Ch. Architecture* (1881); valuable. Reber's *History of Mediæval Art* (1 vol.). C. E. Norton, *Historical Studies on Church Building in the Middle Ages* (1880). Histories of the Organ, by Hopkins (London, 1855); by Wangemann (1879); Encyclopædia Britannica, Art., *Organ*.

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.—J. Schwane (Roman Catholic), *Dogmengesch. d. mittleren Zeit* (787–1517). Works on Literature in the Carolingian times, by Bähr (1840); by Ebert (1880). Monographs by Werner (Roman Catholic), on

Bede (1875); on Alcuin (1876); by Langen (Old Catholic), on John of Damascus; by Hergenröther, on Photius. Reuter, *Gesch. d. religiös. Aufklärung*, from A.D. 900 to 1300 (2 vols., 1875).

FROM A.D. 1073-1300.

THE CRUSADES.—Von Sybel, *Gesch. des I. Kreuzz.* (1881)—translated. G. W. Cox, *The Crusades* (1878), and article in *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Michaud, *History of the Crusades* (3 vols.). Mills, *A History of the Crusades*, etc. (2 vols.). Wallon, *St. Louis et son Temps* (2 vols., nouv. éd., 1878). On the 4th Crusade; Pears, *The Fall of Constantinople* (1 vol., 1886).

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH AND THE PAPACY.—Works on individual popes: Villemain's *Life of Gregory VII.*; Reuter, on Alexander III.; Hurter, on Innocent III. (3d ed., 1845); J. Felton, on Gregory IX. (1 vol., 1886); Drumann, on Boniface VIII. E. Berger, *Les Registres d'Innocent IV.* (1882 sqq.). Works on the Emperor Henry IV., by Flotho, v. Druffel; by Prutz, on Frederick I.; by Kington, on Frederic II. Giesebrecht, *Arnold v. Brescia* (1873). Niehues, *Gesch. d. Verhältnisse zwischen Kaiserth. u. Papstthum im Mittelalt.* (1877).

CHRISTIAN LIFE.—Zöckler, *Krit. Gesch. d. Askese*. Montalembert's *History of the Monks*, etc. (7 vols., 1831-79). Hill's *English Monasticism, its Rise and Influence* (1 vol., 1867). Lives of St. Bernard, by Neander, and by J. G. Morison (London, 1863). Lives of St. Francis, by Hase (1856), by Mrs. Oliphant. Life of St. Dominic, by Lacordaire (1844); also, by E. Carso (1853).

HISTORY OF DOCTRINE.—Haureau, *De la phil. scholast.* (2 vols., 1850) and *Hist. de la phil. schol.* (3 vols., 1872-80). Hampden's *Bampton Lectures* (1832).

Biographies of Anselm, by Hasse (a very instructive and interesting work); of Abelard, by Rémusat (1845), Wilkens (1855), Heyd (1863); of Bernard, by Neander, by Morison, by G. Hüffer (1886); of Hugo of St. Victor, by Liebner; of Thomas Aquinas, by Werner (3 vols., 1859); of Duns Scotus, by Werner (1881); of Roger Bacon, by Werner (1879). Delitzsch, *P. Abälard, ein kritisch. Theolog.*, etc. (1 vol., 1883).

Preger, *Gesch. d. deutsch. Mystik im Mittelalter* (1875); Vaughan's *Hours with the Mystics*. Schmid, *Mysticism. d. Mittelalt.* Also works on the same subject by Helfferich and by Noack. Werner, *Die Scholastik d. später. Mittelalt.* (4 vols., 1881-87).

Sects and Heresies: C. Schmidt, *Hist. et. doct. des Cath. et Albigeois* (2 t., Paris, 1849). The Waldenses, works by Dieckhoff (1851), and by Herzog (1853). These works present the modern, more critical view of Waldensian history. Em. Comba, *Valdo ed i Valdesi avanti la Riforma* (Firenze, 1880). Mentet, *Hist. littéraire d. Vaudois* (1 vol. 1886); valuable. *

FOURTEENTH AND FIFTEENTH CENTURIES.

THE POPES AND THE COUNCILS.—Creighton, *Hist. of the Papacy during the Period of the Reformation*—from 1464 to 1518—4 vols. It is founded on the original authorities, is impartial, and well written. Ranke's *Hist. of the Popes*: title in the new ed., *Die Päpste d. 4 letzten Jhdtn.* L. Pastor, *Gesch. d. Päpste seit dem Ausgang d. Mittelalt.*—the Rom. Cath. counterpart of Ranke's work. Works on the Avignonese Popes, by Baluze Christophe (*Hist. de la papauté au 14e siècle*, Paris 1853), C. Hüfler (1871).

Lenfant, *Hist. du Concile de Pise* (1724), and *Hist. du Concile de Bâle* (1731). Wessenburg, *Die grossen Kirchenversaml. d. 15. u. 16. Jahrds.* (4 vols., 1840). G. Voigt, *Silvio de Piccolomini*, etc. (3 vols., 1856). Gregorovius, *Lucezia Borgia*, etc. (1874).

Llorente, *Hist. de l'Inquisition d'Espagne* (4 vols., 1817-1818); translated. It is criticised from a Rom. Cath. point of view by Hefele, *Der Cardinal Ximenes*, etc. (2 vols., 2d ed., 1851); translated (London, 1860). Rule, *Hist. of the Inquisition* (2 vols., 1874). Lea's *Hist. of the Inquisition* (3 vols., 1888); founded on a study of the sources.

CHRISTIAN LIFE.—C. Schmidt, *Die Gottesfreunde d. 14. Jhdt.* (1851). S. Kettlewell, *Thomas à Kempis and the Brothers of the Common Life* (2 vols., 1882).

CULTURE AND ART.—Burckhardt, *Die Kultur d. Renaissance* (3d ed., 1877); translated. Crowe u. Cavalcaselle, *Gesch. d. Malerei in Ital.* (6 vols., 1869 sq.). Grimm's *Life of Michael Angelo*. Symond's *History of the Renaissance in Italy* (6 vols.). A. von Reumont, *Life of Machiavelli* (3 vols., 1877-82). and *Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (2 vols., 1876; translation). *Life of Erasmus*, by Drummond (2 vols.); of Reuchlin, by Geijer (1871), by Horowitz (1877); of Ulrich von Hutten, by Strauss. Jortin's *Life of Erasmus* is still valuable. Lupton's *Life of John Colet* (1 vol., 1887). Seebohm, *The Orford Reformers of 1498* (Colet and others).

PRECURSORS OF THE REFORMATION.—Ullmann, *Reformers before the Reformation* (2 vols.). Lechler's *Wiclif*, translated, with additions, by Lorimer. It gives a full account of his writings. Buddensieg, *J. Wiclif u. seine Zeit* (1 vol.). Loserth, *Huss u. Wiclif*. Villari's *Life of Savonarola* (new, enlarged ed.). Maurenbrecher, *Gesch. d. Kath. Reformation* (vol. i.). Gillett's *Life of J. Huss* (2 vols., 3d ed., 1871).

THE PERIOD OF THE REFORMATION—FROM 1517-1648.

An extended list of works, down to 1872 (with brief comments), is given in Fisher's *History of the Reformation*.

Among the works on general history, in this period, the highest place belongs to Ranke's *Histories of Germany, France, and England*, and of the Popes (in the last four centuries). Häusser's *History of the Reformation* (1 vol.) is a meritorious work, in a brief compass.

WORKS ON THE REFORMATION AS A WHOLE.—Hagenbach's *Lectures on the history of this period* are now included in his general *History of the Church* (vols. iv.-vii.). The volume of Gieseler, treating of the Reformation, is of extraordinary value. Hardwick's *History of the Reformation* (new ed., 1886), by an English Episcopalian scholar, is full in its references. Henke's *Neuere Kirchengesch.* (2 vols.) begins at the Reformation. D'Aubignô's *History of the Reformation* is a detailed narrative, animated by religious fervor and a zeal for Protestantism, but not always accurate. Ch. Beard, *The Reformation of the XVIth Century, in its Relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge* (Hibbert Lect., 1883), 1884. It presents a somewhat rationalistic interpretation of Christianity, but is well written. Cunningham (Presbyterian), *The Reformers and the Reformation* (1862).

THE GERMAN LUTHERAN REFORMATION.—Under the head of contemporary sources belong the writings of Sleidan, Spalatin, Myconius, the lives of Luther by Melancthon and by Mathesius, the life of Melancthon by Camerarius, etc. The most complete edition of Luther's writings has been that of Walch. Now the critical edition (edited by Knaake) is in process of publication, under the patronage of the German Emperor. Luther's letters, in De Wette's edition (6 vols.), with a 7th suppl. vol. (edited by Bueckhardt). Melancthon's writings—in the *Corpus Reformatorum*, 28 vols.

Historical Works. Seckendorf (d. 1692) is a high authority. Marheineke's *Gesch. d. deutsch. Ref.*, is still valuable.

The series of lives of the "Fathers and Founders" of the Lutheran Church (8 vols.). Kolde's *Martin Luther, seine Biographie* (1884), is good. One of the latest and the best of the biographers of Luther is J. Köstlin. His larger work is in 2 volumes. His smaller work is in 1 volume (translated into English). He has also written a still smaller work, for popular reading.

Janssen's *Gesch. d. deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang d. Mittelalt.* recounts the history of the Reformation from the point of view of an ultramontanist. The first three volumes extend to 1555. There have been many critical answers to Janssen. Among them: Ebrard's (2d ed., 1882), and J. Köstlin, *Luther u. Janssen, der deutsch. Reformator u. ein ultramont. Historiker* (1883). Abp. Spalding (Rom. Cath.), *Hist. of the Ref. in Germany and Switzerland* (1865).

Brieger, *Aleander u. Luther* (1884): Aleander's despatches during the Diet of Worms.

REFORMED CHURCH IN SWITZERLAND.—Among the contemporary sources are Bullinger's *Reformationsgesch.* (to 1532); Fromment's *Les Actes et les Gestes de la Cité de Genève* (1536); Zwingli's Works (10 vols., 1828 sq.). Calvin's Works (ed. Baum, Cunitz, and Reuss, 1863 sq.). Biogr. of Zwingli, by Myconius (1536); of Calvin, by Beza (1564). J. Strickler, *Aktensammlungg. z. schweiz. Refsgsch.* (1521–1532), 1884.

Later Works: Lives of the "Fathers and Founders" of the Reformed Church (10 vols.). Lives of Zwingli, by Christoffel (1857), by Mörikofer (1867). J. M. Usteri, *Initia Zwingli*, etc. (1885), and *Zwingli u. Erasmus*. Lives of Calvin, by Henry—friendly to the Reformer; by Kampschulte, a Roman Catholic—hostile; by Dyer—fair; by Stähelin.

SWEDEN, POLAND, BOHEMIA.—J. Weidling, *Schweden im Zeitalt. d. Ref.* (1831). Butler, *The Ref. in Sweden* (1 vol., 1886). Koniecki, *Ref. in Polen* (1872). Dalton, *John à Lasco* (1881). Gindely, *Böhmen u. Mähren im Zeitalt. d. Ref.* (1857). Peschek, *Gesch. d. Gegenref. in Böhmen* (1844).

FRANCE.—Beza's History of the Reformed Church in France (3 t., 1580). Theod. Agrippa d'Aubigné, *Hist. Universelle* (1550–1601). He was a devoted Huguenot, an associate, for a while, of Henry IV. A. L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les Pays de la Langue française* (5 vols.). Histories of French Reformation, by Soldan (2 vols., 1855); Von Polenz (1858 sq.). H. M. Baird, *The Rise of the Huguenots* (2 vols., 1879) and *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre* (2 vols., 1886). These histories of Professor Baird are scholarly, well written, and impartial. H. White, *The Massacre of St. Bartholomew* (1 vol., 1871).

THE NETHERLANDS.—The old historian of the Reformation is Brandt (English translation, 4 vols., 1720). Motley's *Rise of the Dutch Republic, History of the United Netherlands*, and *Life of Barneveldt*. The works of Holzwarth, *Der Abfall d. Niederlande* (3 vols.), and of Th. Juste, *Hist. de la Révolution des Pays Bas*, etc. (2 vols., 1885). De Hoop-Schaffer, *Gesch. d. Reformation in d. Niederlanden* [to 1531], (Nippold's German translation).

ENGLAND.—Documents and contemporary Sources: Works of the Reformers, published by the Parker Society (54 vols., with an Index). The series includes the *Zürich Letters* (3 vols.); Correspondence of the English with the Swiss Reformers: very important. Pocock's *The Records of the Ref.* (2 vols.) contains original documents. The State Calendars, published by the Master of the Rolls. Letters and Correspondence in the Reign of Henry VIII. Rymer, *Fœdera*, etc. Rushworth, *Historical Collections*. Wilkins, *Concilia Magnæ Brit. et Hib.* (446–1717, 4 vols.).

The General Histories of Ranke, Macaulay (from the accession of James II., with an Introduction), Hume (negligent and inaccurate), Lingard (a Roman Catholic, able); Froude—to the death of Elizabeth—an apologist for the tyranny of Henry VIII.; Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion*—on the side of the Stuarts; Gardiner, Carlyle (*Life and Letters of Cromwell*); Guizot: Histories of Charles I., of the Commonwealth, of the Protectorate of Cromwell; Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*; Stubbs: *Lectures on the Study of Mediæval and Modern Hist.* (1886). This work contains two Lectures on the Reign of Henry VIII.

Histories of the English Reformation: Burnet, honest, with extraordinary means of knowledge, but not free from prejudice (Pococke's ed., 7 vols., 1865). Strype, Ecclesiastical Memorials, Annals of Church and State under Elizabeth, and other writings. His whole works in twenty-seven volumes (1821–40). Strype is veracious, an invaluable authority, although occasionally inaccurate in copying citations. Collier (a nonjuring bishop), Ecclesiastical History of England, to the Death of Charles II. (9 vols., 1846). On the Puritan side—Neal's History of the Puritans, to the Death of Elizabeth. J. H. Blunt (High Church Episcopalian), History of the Reformation to the Death of Wolsey. J. J. Blunt, Sketch of the Reformation in England. Geikie (Low Church Episcopalian), History of the Reformation in England. W. Fitzgerald, *Lectures on Ecclesiastical History* (from Wyclif to the Great Rebellion), 1885. G. G. Perry (Episcopalian), *Hist. of the Church of England, from the Death of Elizabeth* (3 vols.). It extends through the 18th Century. Connected with it, by the same author: *Hist. of the Ch. of England in the 19th Century* (in three periods). J. H. Blunt (Episcopalian—High Church), *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, etc. It contains copious explanatory notes. For the History of Congregationalism, *Hunbury's Historical Memorials* (2 vols.); Two works of Waddington, *Congregational History* (1200–1567 and 1567–1700). Joyce, *Acts of the Church, 1531–1885* (1886). Hardwick's History of the Articles. Lathbury's History of the Book of Common Prayer. Hunt's *History of Religious Thought in England* (2 vols.). Strype's Lives of Cranmer, Parker, Grindal, etc. Todd's Life of Cranmer. Le Bas's Life of Jewel. Fuller's *Ch. Hist. of Britain* (Brewer's ed., 6 vols., 1845) comes down (from the beginning) to 1648. Hook's *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury* (12 vols.). Friedmann's *Anne Boleyn, a Chapter of English History*,

(1527–1536), brings new information from the letters of Chatuys the imperial ambassador.

SCOTLAND.—Contemporary Sources. Wodrow Society's Publications. Spottiswood Society's Publications. John Knox's *History of the Reformation in Scotland*.

McCrie's *Life of John Knox* and his *Life of Andrew Melville*. Histories of the Church of Scotland, by Hetherington, J. Cunningham, Lee (2 vols., 1860). *Life of John Knox*, by W. M. Taylor, is brief and interesting. Lorimer, *Knox and the Church of England* (1 vol., 1875). Stanley's Lectures on the Church of Scotland, and Rainy's Lectures on the same subject (in reply). A. Bellefleur (Roman Catholic), *History of the Catholic Church in Scotland* (400–1560). 1884. Burton's *History of Scotland*.

ITALY.—McCrie's *History of the Reformation in Italy*. T. Erdman, *Die Ref. u. ihre Märtyrer in Ital.* (2d ed., 1876). E. Comba, *Storia della rif. in Italia* (vol. 1, Firenze, 1881). Life of Vergerius, by Sixt; of Peter Martyr Vermigli, by C. Schmidt; of Ochino, by Benrath (Benrath is translated). Life of Olympia Morata, also, of Aonio Paleario, by Bonnet (in French).

SPAIN.—Wiffen's Collection of the writings of Spanish Protestants—*Reformistas*, etc.—20 vols. McCrie's *History of the Reformation in Spain*. Histories by De Castro (1866) and by Pressel (1877). E. Böhmer, *Spanish Reformers of two Centuries* (from 1520). Histories of Spain, by Mariana (Spanish), by St. Hilaire (French), by Dunham (English, 3 vols). Prescott's History of the Reign of Philip II. Ticknor's History of Spanish Literature. Llorente's *History of the Inquisition in Spain*.

SECTS.—(See works on Symbolics.) Trechsel, *Die prot. Anti-trinitarier vor Socin.* (1839). H. Tollin, *Das Lehrsystem Socin.* (3 vols., 1876). On the Anabaptists: Keller (1880), A. Brons (1885), Cornelius (Rom. Cath.), 1855 sqq; Burrage, *A Hist. of Anabaptists in Switzerland* (1 vol., 1881). Burrage reviews the literature on the subject in his preface. On Jacob Böhme, Martensen (1882).

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTER-REFORMATION.—Von Reumont, *Gesch. d. Stadt. Rom.* Philippson, *Die kath. Gegenref. um die mitte d. 16. Jhdt.* (in Oncken's Series), 1884. Maurenbrecher, *Gesch. d. kath. Gegenref.* (1., 1880) Symonds, *The Counter-Reformation* (2 vols.). Monographs by Bauer, on Hadrian VI. (1876); by Hübner, on Sixtus V.; by Gregorovius, on Urban VIII.; by Ciampi, on Innocent X. F. H. Reusch, *Der Index d. verbotenen Bücher*, etc. (2 vols., 1885). Reusch makes use of new sources.

The Council of Trent: Father Paul Sarpi's History of the Council is half Protestant in its tone. On the other side—Pallavicini's History of the Council. Works by Bungener, and by Sickel, on the History of the Council. A. Theiner, *Acta genuina SS. Conc. Trid.* (1874) is a work of much importance. I. v. Döllinger, *Berichte u. Tagebücher zur Gesch. d. Tr. Conc.* (2 vols., 1876).

THE JESUITS.—Histories of the Jesuits by Crétineau-Joly (6 vols.), by Buss (1853)—these are by Roman Catholics; by Huber (Old Catholic); by Julius (2 vols., 1845); by Steinmetz (3 vols.); J. Friedrich (Old Catholic), *Beiträge zur Gesch. d. Jesuit-O's* (1881). Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World* and *The Jesuits in North America*.

Lives of Loyola, by Ribadeneira (1572), Maffei (1585), by H. Baumgarten (1880). Life of Xavier, by Coleridge (1872).

POLEMICAL WRITERS.—The ablest controversialist on the Rom. Cath. side was R. Bellarmine, *Disputt. de Controv.*, etc. (Rome, 1581-93). The ablest antagonist, on the Lutheran side, was Chemnitz, *Examen Concil. Trid.* (1565-73); on the Calvinistic, Chamier, a Huguenot; *Punstratiæ Cath.*, etc. (1626). Recent works, on the Prot. side, are Neander, *Vorless. über Prot. u. Kath.* (posthumous); K. Hase, *Handbuch. d. Prot. Polemik*, etc. (4th ed., 1878). On the Rom. Cath. side, G. Perrone, *Prelect. Theol.* (9 tt., 36th ed., 1881).

Works on Prot. theology: Planck, *Gesch. d. Prot. Lehrbegriffs* (1781, 1800). Gass, *Gesch. d. prot. Dogmatik* (1862). Especially, Dorner's *Hist. of Prot. Theology* (2 vols.). A. Schweizer, on the Reformed (or Calvinistic) theology, *Die prot. Centraldogmen*, etc. (1854); Heppe, on the Lutheran theology, *Dogmatik d. deutschen Prot.*, etc. (1857). On the Rom. Cath. theology, Werner's *Gesch. d. kath. Theol. seit dem trid. Conc.* (1886). A. Baur, *Zwingli's Theol., ihr Werden u. ihr System* (1885). J. Köstlin *Luther's Theologie* (2 vols., 1883). Herrlinger, *Die Theologie Melanchthons* (1879). Galle, *Charakteristik Melanchthons als Theologen*, etc. (1 vol., 1845). Galle explains clearly and correctly Melanchthon's changes of opinion and his relations to Luther, and delineates his personal traits.

Pünjers' *Hist. of the Phil. of the Christ. Religion, from the Reformation to Kant* (1 vol., 1887), is able and non-sectarian: Preface by R. Flint. Hare, *The Ch. in England, from William III. to Victoria* (2 vols., 1886: High Church, Episcopalian).

SYMBOLICS.—An epoch in the treatment of this subject was made by the issue (in 1832) of Möhler's *Symbolik*—translated under the title of Symbolism. Before that time appeared the Works of Marheineke, Winer, and Clausen. Möhler's work was a plausible argument for the Rom. Cath. system, construed according to the theory of development, and according to a comparatively liberal interpretation of its dogmas. In reply to Möhler: F. Chr. Baur, *Gegensatz d. Prot. u. Kath.* (1834); and Nitzsch, *Prot. Beantwortung*, etc. (1835). Other works on Symbolics—by Köllner (1837-44, not completed), by Guericke, by Hilgers (Rom. Cath.), Matthes, Scheckenburger, W. Böhmer, R. Hofmann, Plitt, Oehler (1876). Winer's fair and accurate work is translated, with the title, *A Comparative View of the Doctrines and Confessions*, etc. (Clark's Edinb. Lib., 1873). Delitzsch, *Das Lehrsystem d. röm. Kirche*: incomplete (1 vol.), but brilliant. For information respecting the creeds, see Schaff's work, before referred to, *The Creeds of Christendom* (3 vols.).

FROM A.D. 1648-1887.

WORKS ON GENERAL HISTORY.—Schlosser's *Hist. of the 18th Cent.* (8 vols.) Mahon's *War of the Succession*. Pardoe's *Louis XIV. and the Court of France*, etc. Philippson (in Oncken's series), *Das Zeitalt. d. Louis d. 14ten.*: A. de Broglie, *Louis XV.* Carlyle's *Life of Frederic the Great*. Lives of Voltaire, by Parton, by Morley. Morley's Diderot and the Encyclopædists. Morley's *Life of Rousseau*.

Histories of the French Revolution, by H. M. Stephens (2 vols., 1886), by

Alison (Tory), Mignet, Von Sybel, Häusser, Carlyle ; by Morris (brief). Gazier, *Studies of the French Revolution* (in French).

History of Europe from 1815, by Alison ; German histories of the recent period by Bulle, Wernicke, Müller (Peters's translation). Mackenzie, *Hist. of the 19th Century*. Fyffe, *Hist. of Modern Europe—1792–1848* (2 vols., 1881, 1887). Lodge, *Hist. of Modern Europe* (1453–1878) : in the Students' series, 1886.

Nippold, *Handb. d. neuesten Kirchengesch.* (2 vols.). Nippold's work mingles with the record of facts copious remarks and comments.

SECULAR AND RELIGIOUS HISTORY OF ENGLAND.—The Diaries of Pepys and Evelyn exhibit the state of morals in England after the restoration of the Stuarts. Baxter's Autobiography—*Reliquiæ Baxterianæ*—is full of interest. Brown's *Life of Bunyan* (1 vol., 1885), is of much value. On liturgical discussions between Churchmen and Puritans: C. W. Shields, *The Book of a Common Prayer as amended by the Westminster Divines, A.D. 1661, with a Historical and Liturgical Treatise* (1 vol., 1867). Cardwell, *History of Conferences*—relative to the revision of the Prayer Book (1 vol., 1849). England in the 18th century is described in the histories of Lord Mahon, in Burton's *History of the Reign of Queen Anne* (3 vols., 1880), and in Lecky, *History of England in the 18th Century* (6 vols.). S. R. Gardiner, *History of England* (1603–1642), (10 vols., 1883–84) ; *History of England* (1642–1649), (1st vol., 1886). Gardiner's historical works are fair and trustworthy. Stoughton (Congregationalist), a candid, well-informed author, has written a *History of Religion in England from the Opening of the Long Parliament to the End of the Eighteenth Century* (6 vols.). Macaulay's History begins at the accession of James II., and extends to the death of William III. (5 vols.). May's *Constitutional History* (1760–1860) is important ; it begins where Hallam ends. Abbey and Overton, *Engl. Ch. in the 18th Century* (2 vols.) : impartial and instructive. England in the 19th century—Histories by H. Martineau, by Walpole.

The Latitudinarians : Tulloch's *History of Rational Theology in England* (2 vols.).

The Rise and History of Quakerism.—The *Journal* of George Fox takes us to the origin of the movement. The *Life* of Thomas Ellwood is likewise an autobiography. Sewel's *History of the Quakers* (translated from the Dutch). Barclay's *Apology*, and the writings of Penn, are important as sources of knowledge on the subject. A. C. Brickley, *George Fox and the Early Quakers* (1884). *Life of William Penn*, by S. M. Janny. *Life of Elizabeth Fry*. *Life of T. Fowell Buxton*.

Swedenborgianism.—W. White, *Life of Swedenborg*, etc. (1856). *A Compendium of the Theol. Writings of Swedenborg*, by S. M. Warren : 2d ed., revised, by John Bigelow (1 vol., 1879). T. Parsons, *Outlines of the Religion and Phil. of Swedenborg* (1 vol., 1876).

On the History of English Deism there are three principal works: Leland's, Lechler's (German), and Leslie Stephens's (2 vols.). Stephens's work is able, from a rationalistic point of view.

The Rise and History of Methodism.—Stevens's *History of Methodism*, by an American writer, is full, accurate, and fair. John Wesley's life was written by Watson, by Southey (with much literary ability, from the point of view of a moderate Anglican), and, more lately, by Tyerman (3 vols.), who also wrote

a full biography of Whitefield, and *The Oxford Methodists*—the associates of Wesley and Whitefield there (1 vol., 1873). Overton, *The Evangel. Revival in the 18th Century*: in the Epochs of Ch. History series.

For the American Colonies, and the religious systems planted by them, Bancroft is an authority, and, also, the histories of the American Colonies by Doyle, an English writer. Winsor's *History of the United States* is invaluable. It includes much documentary matter. Palfrey's *History of New England* is the product of thorough investigation, by a very able writer, favorable to the Puritans. Bacon's *Genesis of the New England Churches* (1 vol.) is an admirable account of the Pilgrim Church, and of the rise of the English Independents. Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit* (9 vols.) contains biographies of noted ministers of all denominations. Tracy's "Great Awakening" is a history of the revivals under Edwards and Whitefield. On the history of "New England Theology": S. E. Dwight's *Life of J. Edwards*; Park's *Life of Hopkins*; Park's *Life of Emmons*; Fisher's *Discussions in History and Theology*; Scattered Articles in the *Bib. Sacra* (Index). The different religious bodies have been described in special works. A good list of books on this subject is in the *Theological Encyclopædia* of Crooks and Hurst, Appendix, page 569. Among works of this class are *Histories of Presbyterianism in America*, by Gillett and by Briggs; *Histories of Congregationalism*, by Dexter, J. B. Felt, and by Geo. Punchard; of the Episcopal Church, by Bishop White (3d ed., 1880) and by W. Stevens Perry; of the Baptists, by Backus and (more recently) by Armitage; of Lutheranism, by Schmucker and in Mann's *Life of H. M. Mühlenberg*; of Methodism, by Stevens (a special history of American Methodism); of the Reformed Church (Dutch), in "Centennial Discourses" (1876); of the Reformed (German) Church, by Mayer; of the Quakers, by Janny; for the United Brethren, Drury's *Life of Otterbein* (1885), etc.; for the Unitas Fratrum, De Schweinitz's *History*. On the Huguenots: C. W. Baird, *The H. Emigration to America* (2 vols., 1885). The rise of Unitarianism may be studied in the biographies of Buckminster, father and son—described in one work (by Mrs. Lee), of W. E. Channing (3 vols.), of E. S. Gannett, of Theodore Parker, etc., and in G. E. Ellis (Unitarian), *Half-Century of the Unitarian Controversy* (1857): reviewed by N. Porter, in *The New Englander*, vol. xvi. For the history of the "Transcendental" movement, Frothingham's *Transcendentalism in New England* and his *Life of George Ripley*, but especially the *Life of Margaret Fuller*, and Cabot's *Life of Emerson*, may be examined.

The Roman Catholic Church in America: J. G. Shea (Roman Catholic), *The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, etc. (1886); *History of Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes of the United States* (1529–1854); *The Jesuits, Recollets, and the Indians* (in Winsor's *History of the United States*, IV., c. vi.). G. E. Ellis, *Las Casas, and the Relation of the Spaniards to the Indians* (in Winsor, II., c. v.). Parkman's *Jesuits in North America and Pioneers of France in the New World*. Prescott's *History of the Conquest of Mexico*.

Third Plenary Council of Baltimore: Memorial volume (1885).

The Roman Catholic Church in Europe: On the Jansenists—Sainte-Beuve, *Port-Royal* (5 t., 1860); Reuchlin, *Port-Royal* (2 vols., 1839–44); Bouvier, *Étude crit.* (1864). Biographies of Pascal, by Reuchlin, by Vinet,

by Dreydorff. Schimmelpennick, *Select Memoirs of Port Royal* (5th ed., 1858, 3 vols.): popular and interesting. Ricard, *Les Premiers Jansénistes* (1883)—an anti-Jansenist work.

Quietism in the Roman Catholic Church: Heppe, *Gesch. der quietist. Mystik in d. Kath. Kirche* (1875). Lives of Molinos, by Scharling (1855), by Bigelow (1882). Lives of Madame Guyon, by Hermes (1845), by Guerrier (1881), by Upham.

France: On the Huguenots—E. Hugues, *Les Synodes du Désert* (1885–86). Biographies of Voltaire, by Parton, by Morley. Life of Rousseau, by Morley. W. H. Jarvis, *The Gallican Church and the Revolution* (1882).

On the Church in the 19th Century: Zahn, *Abriss d. Gesch. d. evangel. K. im 19tn. Jahrh.* (1 vol., 1886); confined to the continent. Koffmane, *Abriss*, etc. (1 vol., 1887); a supplement to Herzog's *Kirchengesch.* Hagenbach's History of the Church in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries—translated by Bishop Hurst—is an attractive and just account of the literary and religious events and changes of the period, especially in Germany.

GERMANY.—Dorner's *History of Protestant Theology* is full on the recent period. Tholuck's works—*Das kirchlich. Leben d. 17tn. Jahrh.* (2 vols.), *Der Geist der luth. Theol. Wittenbergs im 17. Jhdt.*, and *Gesch. d. Rationalismus* (I., 1865). On Zinzendorf: Spangenberg's *Leben Z.* (3 vols., 1773–1775). The best of the recent works on Z. is Becker's (1886). Histories of Pietism, by Schmid, by A. Ritschl, by E. Sächsse (to Spener's death), Schleiermacher's *Leben in Briefen* (4 vols., 1858–63), Life of Niebuhr, Life of Perthes, Dilthy's *Leben Schleiermachers* (I., 1870). Life of Baroness Bunsen by A. J. C. Hare (1879). Life of Rothe, L. Witte's Life of Tholuck, *Briefwechsel zwischen Martensen u. Dorner*, 1839–1881 (2 vols., 1888).

England in the 19th century: General Histories by H. Martineau, by Walpole; by Justin McCarthy—*History of our own Times*. G. G. Perry (Episcopalian), *Hist. of the Church of England in the 19th Century* (3 vols.).

The Tractarian Controversy: Tracts for the Times (1833–1841). Newman's Tract No. 90., and the excitement about it, led to the discontinuance of the series. H. Froude, *Remains* (1838–39). Perceval, *A Collection of Papers* (1842). An elaborate Art—*Tractarianismus*—by Schrell, Herzog's *Realencycl.* (ed. 1.) Newman's *Apologia pro vita sua* (1865), Life of Keble, Life of Pusey, Mozley's *Reminiscences* (2 vols.), Views of Anti-tractarians, in T. Arnold's *Miscellaneous Writings*, in his *Life and Correspondence*, by Stanley (2 vols.), Life of Abp. Whately, *Lit. and Theol. Remains* of Bp. Thirlwall (3 vols., 1875–76). Life of Bp. Wilberforce, Life of Shaftesbury (lay leader in the Low Church party).

Brandl's Life of Coleridge (1886). Irving's Collected Writings (5 vols., 1865). Oliphant's *Life of Edward Irving* (2 vols., 1862). For other notices of Irving: Carlyle's *Reminiscences* (Froude), and Froude's *Life of Carlyle* (2 vols., 1882). Hutton, *Essays on some of the Guides of Modern Thought in Matters of Faith*—Carlyle, J. H. Newman, Matthew Arnold, George Eliot, F. D. Maurice (1 vol., 1887).

The Vatican Decrees, with a Hist. of the Council, etc., by P. Schaff (1 vol., 1875). Friedrich (Old Catholic) *Gesch. d. vatikan. Concils*, etc. (3 vols.). *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus (1870), a series of learned discussions ascribed to Döllinger and Friedrich, and antagonistic to the Vatican Council and its

decrees. *Anti-Janus* is a learned ultramontane reply, by Hergenröther. Frommann, *Gesch. u. Kritik d. vatic. Conc.* (1 vol., 1872). *Letters from Rome on the [Vatic.] Council*, by Quirinus; Engl. transl., 1870. These are letters from Rome, by Friedrich and others, giving an account of the proceedings (from the Old Catholic point of view).

On the Old Catholics: Von Schulte, *Der Altkatholicismus* (1887).

CHRISTIAN MISSIONS.—*History of Protestant Missions*, by Dr. Gustav Warneck (transl. by Thomas Smith, D.D., Edinburgh, 1884; an excellent, short history). In the course of the narrative full bibliographies of the different topics are given. Newcomb, *Cyclopædia of Missions*. The old work of Blumhardt (1828–1837) contains rich materials and is still useful; *Versuch einer allgemein. Missionsgesch.* (3 vols., 1828). *Modern Missions: Their Trials and Triumphs*, by Robert Young (1884.) *Light in Lands of Darkness*, by Robert Young (1883). These books supplement each other, and together cover in a satisfactory way the history of Protestant missions. *Short History of Christian Missions*, by George Smith, (Edinburgh); a brief account of the history of missions from the earliest times to the present day. *Protestant Foreign Missions*, by Theodore Christlieb. Transl. fr. fourth German edition, by D. A. Reed (Boston, 1880). *Medical Missions: Their Place and Power*, by John Lowe (London, 1886). Warneck, *Modern Missions and Culture* (transl. by Smith, 1883).

Christian Missions: Their Agents, and Their Results, by T. W. M. Marshall, London (1863): partisan, Roman Catholic. For Catholic Missions in America, see the writings of J. G. Shea (p. 670y).

Hist. of the Sandwich Islands Mission, by Rufus Anderson, Boston (1870). *Hist. of the Missions of the A. B. C. F. M. in India*, by Anderson (1874). *Hist. of the Missions of the A. B. C. F. M. to the Oriental Churches*, by Anderson, 1872.

Lives of Robert and Mary Moffat, by John S. Moffat, N. Y. (1886). *Life of John Coleridge Patteson*, by Charlotte Mary Yonge. Fifth edition (somewhat abridged), London (1884). *Life of Alexander Duff*, by George Smith, N. Y. (1880). *Life of Adoniram Judson*, by Edward Judson, N. Y., 1883. *Life and Letters of David Coit Scudder*, by Horace E. Scudder, N. Y. (1864). *Life of David Livingstone*, by W. G. Blaikie, N. Y., 1881.

INDEX.

ABBREVIATIONS.—K.= king; Q.= queen; Emp.= emperor; Bp.= bishop; Abp.= archbishop; H. R. E.= Holy Roman Empire.

- Abbeys. See Monasteries
 Abbot, Abp. of Canterbury, 399
 Abbots, 113; become great lords, 155; their cupidity, 175; excluded from the Upper House in England, 355
 Abelard, Peter, his career, 212 *seq.*; exalts reason, 213; St. Bernard on his influence, 214; on original sin, 221; on the dominion of Satan, *ib.*; on the atonement, 222
 Absolution, conditioned on repentance, 58; the schoolmen on, 225; relation of, to indulgences, 292
 Abubekhr, 152
 Abyssinia, spread of Christianity to, 98; the Church in, 594
 Acceptilation theory, 222, 443
 Acts of the Apostles, 26, 43
 Adam, Augustine and Pelagius on, 136; the schoolmen on, 220; the Reformers on, 441; the Arminians and Socinians on, *ib.* See, also, Fall, Sin
 Adam, of St. Victor, 238
 Adams, John, 566, 567
 Addison, 663
 Adelbert, 151
 Adiaphoristic controversy, the, 424
 Adoptianist controversy, the, 178
 Adrian VI., 298, 300. See, also, Hadrian
 Advent, the Second, 42, 84, 235; Luther's view of, 451; Swedenborg on, 509; recent views on, 639
 Æneas Sylvius, his early career, 263. See, also, Pius II.
 Ærius, 118
 Africa, Roman Catholic missionaries in, 583; Protestant missions in, 594, 595
 Agapæ, 37, 40, 67
 Agnes of Meran, 193
 Agricola, John, 424
 Agrippa, Herod, 14
 Ahriman, 98
 Aidan, 148
 Ainsworth, Henry, 461
 Aistulf, 159
 Alans, the, 94
 Alaric, 93, 94
 Albert, Emp. H. R. E., 241, 245
 Albert the Great, 205, 216, 218
 Albigenes, the, 194, 204, 272
 Albornoz, Cardinal, 250
 Alcuin, 151; his career, 178, 232, 237
 Aldus Minutius, 279
 Alexander the Great, 9
 Alexander Severus, 49
 Alexander II., Pope, 174. III., 166; at Besançon, 189; contest with Fred. I., 190, 191; relations to Henry II. of England, 190, 191; his decree in regard to taxes, 201. V., 255. VI., 264, 266 *seq.*, 277. VII., 500
 Alexander I., of Russia, 557. II., 557
 Alexander, Bp. of Antioch, 129
 Alexander of Hales, his career, 215; on the treasury of merits, 225
 Alexander of Parma, 345
 Alexandria, founded, 9; Jews in, 14; philosophy at, 71; theological school at, 72, 122; see of, 105
 Alfonso of Naples, 264
 Alfred of England, 176
 Algonquins, the, 457, 458
 Ali, 153
 Allegorical method of interpretation, at Alexandria, 72, 122; among the Protestants, 439; by Swedenborg, 508
 Allen, Father William, 370
 Alva, the Duke of, 344, 345
 Amadeus VIII. (Felix V.), 263
 Amalric of Bena, 218
 Amboise, conspiracy of, 336; edict of, 338
 Ambrose, 91; rebukes Theodosius, 101; an upholder of celibacy of clergy, 101; made bishop of Milan, 102; advocates monasticism, 114; against Jovinian, 116; an effective preacher, 120; a hymn writer, 121; his career, 125; his influence on Augustine, 126; on original sin, 137; sanctions the invocation of angels, 141
 American Baptist Missionary Union, 588
 American Bible Union, 564
 American Board, founded, 562, 588; its work, 588 *seq.*
 American Episcopal Church, the, 567 *seq.*
 Amyraut, 428

- Anabaptists, the, at Münster, 314; in the Netherlands, 341, 345; cause a reaction, 415; their tenets and their history, 424 *seq.*
- Anacletus I., antipope, 214
- Anathema, the, 231
- "Anchorites," the, 111 *seq.*; rapid increase, 112; their influence, 113; their extravagancies, 114
- Andover Theological Seminary, 562, 587
- Andrewes, Bp. J., 378, 404
- Angelo, Michael, 269, 288
- Angels, the Apostolic Fathers on, 81; the Latin Fathers on, 141; in the middle ages, 229; Swedenborg on, 509
- Angelus, Isaac, 194
- Anglican theologians, the, 431
- "Anglo-Catholic" theology, the, 510, 550, 630
- Anglo-Saxons, conversion of the, 146
- Annam, 583
- Annats, the, 249
- Anne, Q. of England, 510, 554, 574
- Anne, of Brittany, 266
- Anne, of Cleves, 355
- Annihilation of the wicked, 85, 448, 640
- Anselm, his career, 211, 212; on the being of God, 219; on faith and reason, *ib.*; on original sin, 220; on the Atonement, 221, 222; on grace, 222
- Ansgar, 146, 163
- Anthony, St., order of, 203
- Anthony of Thebes, 111, 112
- Anthony of Vendôme, K. of Navarre, 335, 336, 337, 338
- Anthusa, 110, 124
- "Antilegomena," the, 79, 139
- Antinomian controversy, the, 424
- Antioch, 9; see of, 105; theological school at, 222
- "Anti-Philippists," the, 424
- Antisthenes, 11
- Apocalypse, the, 44, 139, 438, 439
- Apocrypha, the Old Testament, 438
- Apocryphal writings, 74
- Apollinaris, 133
- Apollonius of Tyana, 603
- Apollo, 28, 43
- Apologists, the, 70, 138, 635
- Apostles, the, 18; their belief that the Messiah had come, 19; their relation to the Jewish law, *ib.*; arraignment of, *ib.*; their labors, 20; conference at Jerusalem, 22, 24; legends of, 33; results of their preaching, 34; influence of, in the early Church, 37; their relation to rulers, 39
- Apostles' Creed, origin of, 67
- Apostolic Constitutions, 66
- Apostolic succession, 54. See, also, Episcopacy
- Aquila, 41
- Aquinas, Thomas, 205; his career, 216, 217; on miracles, 219; on reason, *ib.*; on Anselm's argument, 220; on Divine Providence and other doctrines, *ib.*; on the Atonement, 221, 222; on grace, 222; on the virtues, 223; sanctions
- papal infallibility, *ib.*; on the sacraments, 224; on the treasury of merits, 225; on ordination, 226; on war with infidels, 231; on avarice, 235; a preacher, 237; his political theories attacked by Dante, 244; his theory of merit attacked by Luther, 292
- Arabian schools, the, 209, 217; philosophy, 218
- Aranda, 498
- Arcadius, 94
- Archbishop, the term, 57
- Archdeacons, the power of, 103
- Archelaus, 14
- Architecture. See Church architecture
- Argyle, 487
- Arianism, rise of, 129, 130; among the Teutons, 92, 94, 96; overcome in Gaul, 97; overcome in Spain, 157; spread of, in England, 512; in New England, 615
- Aristotle, his career, 11, 12; remote founder of Scholasticism, 208 *seq.*; his physics and metaphysics used by the schoolmen, 215; his writings examined in the original, 280; attacked by the anti-scholastics, 436, 437
- Arius, 129, 130
- Armada, the Spanish, destruction of, 371
- Armenia, spread of Christianity to, 98, 99; church of, rise of the, 134; recent history of, 559; attempts of the Roman church to win, 583; Protestant attempts to reform, 593
- Armeno-Catholics, the, 559
- Arminianism, rise of, 429, 430; prevails in the English Episcopal Church, 380, 430; Methodist, 519; in New England, 524, 615
- Arminians, rise of the, 429; condemned by the Synod of Dort, 407, 429; on inspiration, 439; their method of interpretation, *ib.*, 440; on grace and on predestination, 442; on justification and on faith, 444; on perseverance, 445
- Arminius, James, 429, 438
- Arndt, 649
- Arnold of Brescia, 188, 189
- Arnold, Abbot of Cîteaux, 194, 205
- Arnold, Thomas, 419, 632
- Arnulf, 172
- Art. See Christian art
- Artois, Count of, 534. See, also, Charles X.
- Asbury, Francis, 576 *seq.*
- Ascension, feast of, 65
- Asceticism, origin of, 61; growth of, 111 *seq.*; Protestant rejection of, 655
- Ascham, Roger, 362
- "Associate Reformed" Presbyterians, 573
- Assumption, festival of the, 160
- Assurance, the Reformers on, 444, 445
- Astruc, 622
- Asylum, right of, 101
- Athanaric, 93
- "Athanasian" Creed, the, 132
- Athanasius, 101, 106; his career, 122, 130, 131

- Athenagoras, 71
 Attonement, the, Apostolic Fathers on, 82, 83; Augustine on, 141; Cyril on, 141; Anselm on, 221; Aquinas on, 221; Abelard on, 223; Duns Scotus on, 223; Amyraut on, 428; the Arminians on, 429, 443; the Reformers on, 443; the Socinians on, 443; Grotius on, 443, 444; Tillotson on, 599; Schleiermacher on, 624; Ritschl on, 628; Coleridge on, 629; recent views on, 638, 639
 Attila, 95
 Augsburg Confession, the, drawn up, 305; adopted in Sweden, 312; main source of the Thirty-nine Articles, 358; on Church and State, 415; an authority in the Lutheran Church, 423; on baptism, 447
 Augsburg, Diet of, 305; Interim, the, 316, 317; Peace of, 317, 417
 Augustine, an upholder of celibacy of clergy, 101; promotes the education of the clergy, 103; against the Donatists, 109; advocate of monasticism, 114; against formalism, 116; an effective preacher, 120; imbued with the Platonic spirit, 123; his career, 126, 127; his writings, 127; his character and influence, *ib.*; on the Trinity, 132, 441; compared with Pelagius, 136; against Pelagianism, *ib.*, 137; his "City of God," 138; use of the Scriptures, 139; on faith and reason, 140; doctrinal views, 140-143; introduces the doctrine of purgatory, 142; his influence on mediæval theology, 210; main authority for Lombard's "Sentences," 214; on slavery, 232; his influence on Luther, 127, 278, 291; on the consequences of the fall, 321
 Augustine, missionary to the Anglo-Saxons, 147
 Augustus, 8
 Aurelius, 12
 Austria, ecclesiastical reform in, 504; later religious history of, 549
 Authorized Version, origin of, 397; completed, 399, 400
 Autos da fé, the, 390
 Avars, attempt to convert the, 152
 Averroes, 218
 Avignon, 245, 529
 Aztec worship, the, 457
 BABINGTON, conspiracy of, 371
 "Babylonian captivity," the, 244, 246; close of, 250
 Bacon, Francis, 347, 370, 382, 383; his career, 436, 437, 498
 Bacon, Roger, his career, 217
 Balfour, Walter, 617
 Ballou, Hosea, 617
 Baltimore, the Lords, 477, 478
 Bancroft, Abp., 378, 379, 397 *seq.*
 Baptism, early customs regarding, 41, 66, 67; doctrine concerning, of the Apostolic Fathers, 84; later view, 110, 119, 141; the schoolmen on, 224; the Roman Catholics on, 444; the Reformers on, 447; the Irvingites on, 555
 Baptism of infants, early practice of, 41, 67; declared necessary to salvation, 142, 226; its efficacy, 224; Anabaptists on, 424, 426; Milton on, 435; the Reformers on, 446
 Baptist Missionary Society, the, 586
 Baptists, the, their origin and rise, 424, 426; persecuted, 381; in Virginia, 475; in Rhode Island, 472, 476; the English, in the eighteenth century, 523; the General, 523; the Particular, 523; in Denmark, 547; toleration given to, in the United States, 559, 560; reason for their rapid increase, 561; their history in United States, 563, 564; their missionaries, 585, 590, 591, 595
 Barbarians, the inroads of, 92, 94, 95, 97
 Bar-cochab, 33
 Bardas, 177
 Barnabas, 21, 22, 43
 Barnabas, Epistle of, 70, 79
 Barnes, Albert, 572
 Barneveld, John of, 407
 Baronius, 435
 Barrow, Isaac, 432
 Barrowe, Henry, 460, 461, 470
 Basel, council of, 260 *seq.*; the Reformation at, 308; confessions of, the, 427; missionary society at, 588
 Basil, the emperor, 177
 Basil of Caesarea, 101, 113; his *rule*, 114; his career, 123; influence on Ambrose, 125; influence in establishing the Nicene theology, 131
 Basilica, the, 63, 117, 235
 Basilus, 164
 Baur, F. C., 626
 Baxter, Richard, his theological career, 433; on inspiration, 439; on the Trinity, 441; on witchcraft, 481; on Episcopacy, 486; trial of, 489
 Beaton, 356, 363, 364
 Beccaria, 659
 Beda, the Syndic, 330
 Bede, the Venerable, 149, 178
 Beecher, Edward, 637
 Beecher, Lyman, 562, 572
 Beghards, the, 207, 272
 Béguines, the, 207, 272
 Belgic Confession, the, 427
 Belgium, 536; religious conflicts in, 546
 Bellamy, Joseph, 613
 Bellarmine, Robert, 374, 435, 436, 500
 Belsham, Thomas, 615
 Benedict IX., 172. XI., 244. XII., 248. XIII., 253; his obstinacy, 253, 254, 255, 257. XIV., 500
 Benedict, anti-pope, 173
 Bededict of Nursia, 115
 Benedictines of St. Maur, 412
 Benefit of clergy, rise of, 100, 101
 "Benefits of Christ," the, 385; suppressed, 390
 Benevolence, mediæval, 234
 Bengel, 507
 Bentley, Richard, 605

- Berengar II., 171
 Berengarius, 209, 211
 Berkeley, Bp., 513, 606, 608, 609
 Berkeley, Sir William, 476
 Berlin Conference, the, 558
 Bernard of Clairvaux, his remark on Arnold of Brescia, 188; starts the second crusade, *ib.*; his career, 203, 204, 213, 214; at war with infidels, 231, 232; a hymn writer, 238
 Bernard of Morlais, 238
 Bernard, Bp. of Pamiers, 242
 Berne, the Reformation at, 308, 323
 Berquin, Louis de, 332
 Bert, Paul, 541
 Bertha, 146, 147
 Bertrade, 185
 Bertrand (Clement V.), 244
 Bessarion, 279
 Beza, Theodore, a friend of Calvin, 324; at Geneva, 328; at Poissy, 337; a hymn writer, 421; a teacher of Arminius, 429
 Bible, use of in Period III., 116; neglected by the schoolmen, 215; forbidden, 219; studied in the original, 279; in Puritan New England, 468. See, also, Scriptures, Inspiration
 Biblical chronology, the, arranged, 431
 Biblical criticism, beginning of, 430; promoted by Spinoza, 438; recent, 621, 622, 625, 626
 Biel, Gabriel, 272
 Bingham, Joseph, 433
 Binney, Thomas, 640
 Bird, Isaac, 592
 Bishops, the term, its first use, 36; identical with presbyters, 52, 53; Jerome on, 52; its use in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," 53; appointment of, in Period III., 103; identity with presbyters forgotten, 103; ranks, 104; the country, office discontinued, *ib.*; become great lords, 155, 174, 202; quarrel about the investiture of, 183 *seq.*; in *partibus infidelium*, 203; Marsilius on, 247. See, also, Episcopacy
 Bismarck, 539, 540
 Blackstone, Sir W., 482
 Blandina, 48
 Bleek, 622, 627
 Blount, Charles, 603
 "Blue Laws," the, 468
 Blunt, J. H., 372
 Boccaccio, 278
 Boehler, Peter, 516
 Boehm, Martin, 579
 Boehme, Jacob, 514, 649
 Boethius, his career, 128
 Boetius, a Calvinistic theologian, 428
 Bohemia, the conversion of, 164; church in, subject to Roman see, 165; religious movement in, 256, 274, 275; aroused by the burning of Huss, 260; sympathizes with the Saxon reformers, 312, 313; Catholic reaction in, 393, 409
 Bohemian brethren, the, 333. See, also, Brethren in Unity
 Boleslaus II., of Bohemia, 165
 Boleyn, Anne, 348, 349, 354
 Bolingbroke, 606
 Bollandists, the, 229
 Bolsec, 324
 Bonaparte, Joseph, 531. See, also, Napoleon
 Bonar, 664
 Bonaventura, 206, 215
 Boniface II., 138. VIII., 200, 240 *seq.* IX., 251 *seq.*
 Boniface (Winifred), 150, 151, 155, 156, 159
 Book of Sports, the, 403
 Borgia, Caesar, 267, 268; Lucretia, 267
 Borromeo, Carlo, 392
 Bossuet, 494 *seq.*, 601
 Boston founded, 464
 Boucher, Jean, 361
 Boucicaut, Marshal, 253
 Bowring, 664
 Boyle, Robert, 604
 Boyle Lectures, the, 604
 Bradford, William, 462
 Bradwardine, Thomas, 218; his career, 272
 Brahmanism, 589
 Brainerd, David, 584, 651
 Brandis, 647
 Brébeuf, 458, 459
 Brethren of the Hospital of St. John, 203, 208
 "Brethren of the Sword," 165
 Brethren in Unity, the, 313. See, further, the Moravians.
 Brewster, William, 461, 462, 463
 Briçonnet, 331
 Britain, conquered by Rome, 8; spread of Christianity to, 46; conquest of by the Saxons and Angles, 95; the Church in, 89; languishes, 95; Christians in, their independence, 147, 149; their strife with the Saxon Christians, 148
 British and Foreign Bible Society, 587, 593
 Broad Church party, later history of, 631, 632
 Broglie, 541
 Brown University, 564
 Browne, George, 382
 Browne, Robert, 460
 Browne, Sir Thomas, 482
 Browning, Robert, 646
 Brownists, the, 405. See, also, Independents.
 Brownson, Orestes A., 580
 Brucioli, 385
 Bruno, Giordano, 437
 Bucer, Martin, 310, 320, 324, 358, 359, 427
 Buckingham, Duke of, 399, 401
 Buddha, 78, 111, 589, 591, 592
 Buffet, 541
 Bulgarians, conversion of the, 164; advised by Nicholas I., 228; Church of, subjected to the see of Constantinople, 177; the modern, 558
 Bull, George, 431, 601
 Bullinger, 327, 353, 371 *seq.*
 Bunyan, John, 488

- Burgundians, the, 94, 96
 Burnah, 591
 Burnet, Bp., 432, 433, 448, 512, 599
 Burton, Asa, 613
 Bushnell, Horace, 615, 638
 Butler, Joseph, 511, 513, 608, 609
 Buxton, Sir T. F., 660
 Buxtorf, 439
 Byron, 642
 Byzantine architecture, 235

 CÆDMON, 149
 Cæsar Borgia, 267, 268
Cæsaro-papismus, 417
 Caiaphas, 17
 Cainites, 77
 Cajetan, Cardinal, 293, 435
 Calamy, E., 523
 Calas, Jean, 543
 Calixtines, the, 260, 261, 313
 Calixtus II., 187. III., 264
 Calixtus, George, 497
 Callender, Elisha, 564
 Calvin, John, on Augustine, 127; compared with Luther, 290; on the Lord's Supper, 315; his early life, 318; destined for the priesthood, *ib.*; studies law at Bourges and Orleans, *ib.*; his health undermined, 319; studies the Scriptures, *ib.*; his "sudden conversion," *ib.*; flies from Paris, *ib.*; visits Béarn, *ib.*; goes to Basel, 320; writes the "Institutes," *ib.*; his dedication to Francis I., *ib.*; his characteristics, *ib.*, 321; his doctrinal teaching, 321; his teaching compared with Augustine and Luther, *ib.*; a commentator, 322; his personal traits, *ib.*, 323; arrives at Geneva, 323; banished from the city, 324; meets Melancthon, *ib.*; his marriage, *ib.*; relations with the followers of Zwingli, *ib.*, 358; recalled to Geneva, 325; creates a new civil and ecclesiastical order at Geneva, *ib.*; his relations to Servetus, 326, 327; his theological labors, 328; his influence in France, *ib.*, 334, 337; his last days, 328; his death, 329; estimate of, *ib.*; influence of his system, *ib.*, 330; his influence on John Knox, 328, 364, 367; his influence in England, 371, 372; advises the king of Poland to retain bishops, 373; his ideas on worship, 421; as a theologian, 427; on the Scriptures, 439; on imputation, 441; on the atonement, 443; on assurance, 445; on the baptism of infants, 446; on the Lord's Day, 448
 Calvinism, its influence on civil liberty, 329, 330; its theory of the powers of Church and State, 329; in England, 377, 380; how distinguished from Lutheranism, 423; its polity, 417, 418
 Calvinists, the, in Poland, 313; in Hungary, 314; in the Netherlands, their intolerance, 345; their conflict with the Arminians, 407, 429; deny the *Cujus regio* doctrine, 369; toleration granted to, by the Peace of Westphalia, 410; their ideas on worship, 419; doctrinal teaching, sources, 427, 428; on the person of Christ, 442; on grace, *ib.*; on justification, 444; on perseverance, 445; on baptism, 447; on the civil magistracy, *ib.*; on the Lord's Supper, *ib.*
 Cambrai, league of, 268
 Cambridge platform, the, 466, 467
 Cambridge, University of, the Latitudinarians at, 598
 Cameron, John, 428
 Cameronians, the, 554, 556
 Campbell, Alexander, 565
 Campbell, George, 448
 Campbell, J. McL., 555, 638, 639
 Campbellites, the, 565
 Campeggio, 300, 348, 349
 Candlish, R. S., 629
 Canisius, 435
 Canon, origin of the N. T., 78, 79, 139; the Reformers on, 438
 Canonical life, the, 156, 175
 Canonization, 176
 Canterbury, See of, 147, 157
 Canute, 163
 Capital Crimes, number in England in 1638 and in 1819, 466; in New Haven in 1638, 466
 Capuchins, the, 412, 500, 583
 Caracalla, 48
 Caraffa (see Paul IV.), a member of the Oratory of Divine Love, 384; made cardinal, 386; organizes the Theatins, *ib.*; on the spread of Lutheran heresy in Italy, 385; at the Council of Trent, 388; organizes the Italian Inquisition, 389
 Carbonari, the, 534
 Cardinals, college of, founded, 173
 Carey, William, 585, 586, 590
 Carloman, 151
 Carlos, Don, 534
 Carlstadt, 293, 294, 299, 301, 310
 Carlyle, Thomas, 643
 Carmelites, the, order of, 203, 583
 Carnesecchi, Pietro, 385, 390
 Carranza, Bartholomé de, 391
 Carroll, John, 580
 Carthage, Church planted in, 45; council of, 139
 Carthusians, the, order of, 203
 Cartier, 457
 Cartwright, Thomas, 377, 378, 380
 Casaubon, Isaac, 436
 Cassander, George, 497
 Cassian, John, his career, 114, 127, 138
 Cassiodorus, 128
 Catacombs, the, 64
 Catechumens, instruction of, 66, 72, 119
 Catharine II. of Russia, 498
 Catharine of Arragon, 347, 348
 Catharine de Medici, 335 *seq.*
 Catharine, St., 250
 Catharine von Bora, 301
 Catharists, the, 194, 330
 Cathedrals, the mediæval, 236
 Catholic Apostolic Church, the, 555
 Catholic Epistles the, 43

- Catholic League, the, in France, 340
 Catholic reaction, the, in France, 338; in Ireland, 332; the originators of, 386; promoted by the Jesuits, 387; aim of, 389; power of, 391, 392; effect of on literature, etc., 392; promoted by emperors, 408
 Cavaignac, 540
 Cavalho, Marquis of Pombal, 501, 503
 Cavour, 544
 Cazalla, Augustine, 390
 Cecil, Lord Burleigh, 363, 370, 377, 399, 460
 Cecil, Robert, 632
 Celestine III., 202. V., 200, 243
 Celibacy, clerical, rise of, 62, 101; rejected by the British Church, 148; attempts of Hildebrand to enforce, 173, 174, 183; after the Reformation, 446
 Celsus, 72, 80
 Cerinthus, 76
 Cesarini, Cardinal Julian, 260, 289
 Chalcedon, council of, 105, 106, 134, 135
 Chalmers, Thomas, 555, 587, 629; his career, 556, 652, 653, 654
 Chalons, battle of, 95
 Champlain, 457
 Channing, William Ellery, 616, 617
 Charity, mediæval, 234, 235
 Charlemagne (Charles I., the Great, Roman emp.), converts the Saxons, 151; his ecclesiastical reforms, 155; patrician of Rome, 159; crowned emp. of Rome, *ib.*; efforts for educated clergy, 101; his Slave converts, 164; his relation to the church, 168; death of, *ib.*; intellectual revival under, 178; fosters education, 209
 Charles II., the Bald, 170, 180. III., the Fat, 171. IV., Emp. H. R. E., 248, 274, 295. V., elected emperor, 296; his aims, *ib.*; at the Diet of Worms, 297, 298; his alliance with Leo X., 298; victory over Francis I., *ib.*; obliged to tolerate the Lutherans, 304, 314; at the Diet of Augsburg, 305; his schemes against the Protestants, 315; conquers the Smalcaldic league, 316; quarrels with Paul III., *ib.*; establishes the Augsburg Interim, *ib.*; forced to fly by Maurice, 317; his great disappointment, 318; attempts to check the Reformation in the Low Countries, 341, 342, 343; his relations with Henry VIII., 347, 348, 354, 356; adviser of "Bloody" Queen Mary, 359; scene at his death-bed, 391; hated by Paul IV., *ib.*
 Charles I., of England, proposed marriage alliance of, 399; Mrs. Col. Hutchinson on his spirit and aims, 400, 401; his absolutism, 401, 403; beheaded, 407. II., 478 *seq.*; 554
 Charles IV., of France, 246. VII., 262. VIII., 266, 267, 277. IX., 336, 339. X., 534, 535
 Charles Albert, K. of Sardinia, 540
 Charles III., of Spain, 498
 Charles XII., of Sweden, 507
 Charles of Anjou, 199, 200
 Charles of Bourbon, 298
 Charles of Durazzo, 251
 Charles the Lame, 251
 Charles Martel, 150, 151, 154, 155, 158
 Charles of Valois, 245
 Chaucer, 278
 Chauncey, Charles, 527
 Chemnitz, 424
 Cheverus, 580
 Chiliasm, 84, 85
 Chillingworth, William, 600
 China, early attempts to convert, 167, Roman Catholic missionaries in, 455, 583; Protestant missionaries in, 591, 592
 "Chinese customs," the, 500, 582
 Chivalry, 207, 229
 Choiseul, 498
 Christ, the Gnostics on the divinity of, 76; the Manichæans on, 77; the Apostolic Fathers on, 80, 81; the Monarchians on, 81; the Humanitarians on, *ib.*; the Patripassianists on, *ib.*; the Sabellians on, *ib.*; Arius on, 129; Council of Nicea on, 130; Nicene Creed on, 132; Mohammed on, 154; the Paulicians on, 162; the Socinians against, 431, 442; Channing on, 616; Schleiermacher on, 624; Ritschl on, 628
 Christ, life of, writers on, 625, 626, 627; recent interest in, 637. See, also, Jesus
 Christ, the person of, the Gnostics on, 76; the Manichæans on, 77; the Apostolic Fathers on, 82; the Monarchians on, 81; the Humanitarians on, *ib.*; the Patripassianists on, *ib.*; the Sabellians on, *ib.*; Apollinaris on, 133; the Alexandrian view of, *ib.*; the Antiochian view of, *ib.*; Nestorius on, *ib.*; the Monophysites on, 134; Chalcedon Creed on, *ib.*; the Monothelites on, *ib.*; the sixth œcumenical council on, *ib.*; the Adoptianists on, 178; Schwenckfeld on, 426, 427; the Socinians on, 442; the Reformers on, *ib.*; Swedenborg on, 509
 Christ, the pre-existence of, the Apostolic Fathers on, 80; Ritschl on, 628
 Christ, work of, the Apostolic Fathers on, 82, 83; Augustine on, 141; Anselm on, 221; Abelard on, 222; Duns Scotus on, *ib.*; the Socinians on, 431, 442; the Reformers on, 443, 444; Law on, 514
 Christian art, 64, 117, 420
 Christian festivals, 64, 118, 119
 Christian II., of Denmark, 311. III., 311
 Christian of Anhalt, 409
 Christian David, 506
 Christianity, the early spread of, 34; in relation to slavery, 39; rapid progress of in the second and third centuries, 45, 46; made an illegal religion, 47; charged with being the cause of national misfortunes, *ib.*; toleration of, 49; legalized, 50; effect of, Justin Martyr on, 59; Origen on, *ib.*; effect of, on the

- family, 60; its positive and negative work, 61; becomes corrupt, 90, 110; early arguments for the truth of, 139; influence of at the beginning of the Middle Ages, 161; extent of at the beginning of the Reformation, 449
- Christians, the term, 25; the Jewish, 37, 40; the Gentile, 38; the early, false charges against, 48; by Celsus, etc., 80; persecution of, see Persecution; behavior of, under persecution, 50, 51; fraternal love of, 59; faults of, 60; separation of from heathenism, *ib.*; exclusion of from amusements, 61
- Christmas, 65, 119
- Chrodegang, 156
- Chrysippus, 11
- Chrysoloras, 279
- Chrysostom, against formalism, 116; a great preacher, 121; his career, 124; the teacher of Cassian, 127; on free will and grace, 137; rejects the Apocalypse, 139; on inspiration, *ib.*; on apparitions of the dead, 143
- Chubb, Thomas, 606
- Church, the, the Apostolic Fathers on, 83; the Nicene Creed on, 132; Augustine on the authority of, 140; Augustine on notes of, 141; the Gallicans on, 254, 255; Calvin on, 321; the Reformers on, 445
- Church, the Apostolic founding of, 17 *seq.*; growth of, 34 *seq.*
- Church, the, during the Middle Ages, its relation to war, 231; relation to slavery and serfdom, 232
- Church, Anglo-Saxon, 149, 155, 156, 157
- Church architecture, 63, 117, 235, 236, 392
- Church, the Eastern, type of doctrine in, 122; relation to the papacy, 158; rupture with the Western Church, 176, 177. See, also, Greek Church
- Church, Frankish, 151, 155, 156, 157
- Church History, scope and function of, 1; divisions of, in regard to subject matter, 2, 3, 4; in regard to chronology, 4, 5, 6; summary of periods of, 6; early writers of, 128; promoted by the Armenians, 430
- Church Missionary Society, the, 586, 590, 591, 594, 595
- Church music, 65; in Period III., 121
- Church property, growth of, 100; alienated, 175, 408; a corrupting influence, 183; extent of, 183, 184, 234; in France, 527, 528
- Church and State, their connection, early investigations in regard to, 244; Calvin on, 329; in the Netherlands, 345, 346; in England, under Henry VIII., 350, 351; under Elizabeth, 351; Cartwright on, 377; general remarks on, 413; in Mohammedanism, 414; in the ancient world, 414; the Reformers on, 414 *seq.*; the Lutherans on, 415; later Lutheran theories in regard to, 416, 417; in Zurich, 417; in Geneva, 417, 418; in England, later theories, 418, 419; Rothe on, 419; the Mennonites on, 426; Spinoza on, 438; Davenport on, 465; under Cromwell, 485; Vane on, *ib.*; in America, 559 *seq.*
- Church, the Western, type of doctrine in, 122
- Church union, schemes of, 497, 662
- Cicero, 231; on the value of piety, 413
- Circumcellions, the, 114
- Circumcision, festival of, 119
- Cistercians, the order of, 203
- Claiborne, 478
- Clairvaux, monastery of, 204
- Clara, St., order of, 206
- Clarendon, 486, 487, 488
- Clarke, John, 563
- Clarke, Samuel, 601, 604, 609
- Clarkson, Thomas, 660
- Claudius of Turin, 178
- Clémangis, Nicholas de, 237, 253
- Clement of Rome, 58, 65, 69, 74, 80
- Clement II., 172. IV., 217, 233. V., 167, 243, 245, 246. VI., 248, 249, 271. VII., 298, 300, 304, 350. VIII., 411, 442. XI., 504. XII., 500. XIV., 502, 503
- Clement III., anti-pope, 185. VII (schismatic), 250 *seq.*
- Clement, Flavius, 34
- Clement of Alexandria, 72
- Clement an Irish monk, 151
- Clement, the Second Epistle of, 69
- Clementine Homilies, the Pseudo, 74
- Clergy, the primitive parity of, 52; choice of, 54; support of, 55; qualifications of, *ib.*; celibacy of, 62, 101; receive new legal rights, 100; jurisdiction of, 100, 101; courage of, 101; exaltation of, 101; education of, 102; appointment of, 102, 103; ranks of, 103; vestments of, 121; degeneracy of the mediæval, 161, 176; effect of the feudal system upon, 174, 175; the relation of, to the civil power, 201; exemption from taxation, *ib.*; exemption from civil jurisdiction, *ib.*, 202; Protestant view of, 445
- "Clericis laicos," the bull, 241
- Cloisters, origin of, 113; mediæval, 234. See, also, Monasteries
- Clotilde, 96
- Clovis, 96, 97
- Clugny, "congregation" of, 175
- Cocceius, 423, 439, 441
- Conclave, the, 200
- Coelestius, 136, 137
- Connobites, the, 113, 114
- Coke, Sir Edward, 398
- Coke, Thomas, 518, 577, 586
- Colani, 543
- Colenso, 550
- Coleridge, S. T., 285, 316, 419, 597, 629
- Colet, John, 282, 283, 284
- Coligni, Admiral, 335, 337, 338, 339
- "Collegial system," the, 417
- Collier, Jeremy, 514
- Collins, Anthony, 605
- Colman, 148, 149

- Cologne, University of, 280
 Colonna, Otto (Martin V.), 259
 Colonna, Sciarra, 243
 Colonna, Vittoria, 385
 Colosse, church at, infected with Gnostic error, 75
 Colossians, the Epistle to the, 29, 43
 Columba, 146
 Columban, 150
 Columbus, 288, 450, 451
 Commodus, 48
 Commonwealth, the, 478, 484
 Communists, the, in Paris, 541
 "Compactata," the, 261
 Comte, 634
 Conant, T. J., 564
 Concomitance, doctrine of, 224
 Concordat, of Vienna, 263; of Worms, 187
 Condillac, 618
 Confession, auricular, function of, 109; relation of, to penance, 225; necessity of, denied by Wyclif, 274
 Confirmation, the schoolmen on, 224; Wyclif on, 274; Lutherans on, 420
 Congregation of the Propaganda, founded, 412; its work, 582
 "Congregation," the, in New England, 476
 Congregational system, the, 466
 Congregationalists, the, rise of 460 *seq.*; in England, 553; in the U. S., 559, 561, 562, 563; their missionaries, 587, 588
 Connecticut colony, the, political system of, 465; united with the New Haven colony, 466; tolerant policy of, 559
 Conrad the Hohenstaufen, 183
 Conrad, son of Henry IV., 185
 Conrad, son of Frederick II., 199
 Conrad of Waldhausen, 274
 Conradin, 199
 Consalvi, 533, 534
 Consistories in the Lutheran churches, 416
 Consociations in Connecticut, 466, 467
 Constance, council of, 256 *seq.*
 Constans, Roman emp., 89, 131
 Constantia, 192
 Constantine, his birth, 87; his edict of toleration, 50; conversion of, 87, 88; a builder of churches, 63; relation of, to the Church, 88, 89; exhorted by Athanasius, 101; ecclesiastical power of, 99, 100; legislates for the observance of Sunday, 118; calls the council of Nicea, 129; his attitude towards the decision, 130; his pretended "donation," 170; death of, 89. VI., 159
 Constantine the Paulician, 162
 Constantine Ponce de la Fuente, 390
 Constantinople, see of, made equal to the see of Rome, 105; council of, 105, 131, 132; Latin empire at, 194, 201; threatened by the Turks, 261; taken by the Turks, 264, 279
 Constantinus Pogonatus, 134
 Constantius, Roman emp., 89, 90
 Constantius Chlorus, 50, 87, 89
 Constitution of the U. S., the, 560, 561
 Constitutions of Clarendon, 190
 Contarini, a member of the Oratory of Divine Love, 384; at Venice, 384, 385; cardinal, 386; at Ratisbon, 314
 Conventicle Act, the, 487
 Convocation, the, of the English clergy, 349, 350, 351, 551
 Conybeare, John, 605
 Cop, Nicholas, 319
 Copernicus, 437
 Copping, 460
 Coptic Church, the, rise of, 134; attempts of the Roman Church to win, 583; Protestant attempts to reform, 594
 Coquerels, the, 543, 544
 Corinth, church at, 28; admonished by Paul, 39
 Corinthians, the Epistles to the, 28; Epistle to, by Clement of Rome, 69, 79
 Cornelius, Bp. of Rome, 49
 Corporation Act, 551
 Cortez, 456
 Corvino, John de Monte, 167
 Cosimo de' Medici, 264, 280
 Cosmas Indicopleustes, 98
 Cosmological argument, the, 220
 Cotton, John, 464, 465, 467, 472, 473
 Councils, general, convoked by the early Christian emperors, 99, 129; functions of, 129, 130; character of, 135; authority of, 140; theory of, Occam on, 247; Marsilius on, 247; Gallicans on, 254; papal view, 255; may err, 257; the Protestants on, 423. See, also, the Appendix.
 Court, Antoine, 542
 Cousin, 634
 Covenanters, the, 488, 489
 Covenants, the, doctrine of, Westminster creeds on, 406; becomes wide-spread, 428
 Coverdale, Miles, 354
 Cowper, 522, 632, 664
 Cranach, 304
 Cranmer, Thomas, 313; made abp., 349; on the ecclesiastical power of the king, 351; his early career, 352, 353; becomes a Lutheran, 353; his character, *ib.*; "the Great Bible," 354; accepts the Six Articles, 355; his labors under Henry VIII., 356; becomes an avowed Protestant, 357, 358; on the Eucharist, 359; receives Knox, 364; on predestination, 372; on Episcopacy, 374; his relations with foreign divines, 375; Lambeth chapel under, 381; a leading theologian, 431; sent to the Tower, 359; recants, 360; recalls his denials, and is burned, 361; effect of his death, *ib.*
 Crell, Nicholas, 408
 Crellius, 431
 Criminal law, reform of, 659
 Cromwell, Oliver, 405, 406, 407, 434, 484, 485
 Cromwell, Thomas, 352, 354, 355, 356
 Crotus Rubianus, 232
 Crusades, the, origin of, 186; the effect of

- on the papacy, *ib.*; the first of the, *ib.*; second, 188; third, 191; fourth, 193, 194; fifth, 196; sixth, 201; seventh, *ib.*; plenary indulgence given to those who go on, 225; stimulate the desire for relics, 230; a religious duty, 231; end of, 201; against heretics, 194, 260; against the Hohenstaufens, 196, 199; against the Turks, ineffectual attempts to start, 264, 265
- Crypto-Calvinism, 408
- Cudworth, Ralph, 482, 598
- Cumberland Presbyterian Church, the, 572
- Cummins, George D., 570
- Cunningham, William, 629
- Cutler, Timothy, 565
- Cynics, the, 11
- Cyprian, teaches apostolic succession, 55; on the unity of the Episcopate, 57; opposition to, 58; against actors, 61; as a theologian, 73; on the Church, 83; on the eucharist, 84; martyrdom of, 49
- Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, 122, 133, 135, 138
- Cyril Lucar, 412
- Cyrril, the missionary, 164, 165
- D'Ailly, Peter, 253 *seq.*
- D'Albret, Henry, 332
- D'Albret, Jeanne, 335
- D'Alembert, 619
- D'Allemand, 262
- Damiani, Peter, 173, 174, 176
- Daniel, Father, 458
- Danish-Halle mission, the, 584, 589
- Dante, 228, 243, 244, 278, 383
- Darboy, 541
- Darby, J. N., 553
- Darnley, 366, 367
- Darwin, C. R., 633
- D'Aubigné, Merle, 549
- Davenport, John, 465, 473
- David of Dinanto, 218
- D'Azeglio, 544
- Deaconess, 40, 62; office of, discontinued, 103
- Deacons, first appointed, 20, 35; functions of, 40; rank of, 53; power of, 103
- Decius, 48, 49
- Deism, 601 *seq.*; defects of, 607
- De Maistre, 535
- Demetrius, 556
- Demons, the Apostolic Fathers on, 81; Augustine on, 140; in the middle ages, 229; during the witchcraft delusion, 479. See, also, Satan
- Denmark, conversion of, 163; the Reformation in, 311, 312; later religious history of, 547
- Depravity, doctrine of, the Apostolic Fathers on, 82; Augustine and Pelagius on, 136; the schoolmen on, 220; the Socinians deny, 431; total, 441
- De Quincey, 629
- Des Cartes, 436, 437
- De Tournon, 500
- De Wette, 622, 628
- Diderot, 619
- Didymus, 122
- Dies stationum*, 62
- Diocletian, 50, 78, 87, 89
- Diogenes, 11
- Diognetus, Epistle to, 70, 80
- Dionysius, the Areopagite, 33
- Dionysius Exiguus, 109, 169
- Dioscuros, 134
- Disestablishment, in Ireland, 551; question of, in England, *ib.*, 552
- Dissenters, in England, oppressed, 510, 511; rights conceded to, 551
- Doddridge, 513, 523, 524, 611, 663
- Dodwell, Henry, 605
- Döllinger, 316, 539
- Dominic, St., 205
- Dominicans, the order of, constituted, 195; control the inquisition, 194; become schoolmen, 210; on the eucharist, 225; reject the immaculate conception, 226; and Reuchlin, 282; attack the Molinists, 442; in North America, 450, 457; their enmity against the Jesuits, 499, 500; as missionaries, 583
- Dominus ac redemptor noster*, the bull, 503
- Domitella, Flavia, 34
- Domitian, 33
- Donation of Constantine, 170
- Donatists, 109, 141, 142
- Don Carlos, 366
- Don John, 345
- Donne, 422
- Dorner, 424, 627, 636, 638, 640, 641
- Dort, Synod of, 407, 427, 429, 442, 448, 477
- Douay, Catholic college at, 370
- Douglas, Bp., 606
- Dragonnade*, the, 493
- Drake, Sir Francis, 370
- Drama, the religious, 239; the modern, origin of, 239
- Druses, 558
- Druthmar, Christian, 179
- Dryden, 514
- Duché, Rev. J., 566
- Duff, Alexander, 587, 590
- Duffield, George, 572
- Dunkers, the, 565
- Dunster, Henry, 563
- Dothelites, the, 134
- Dupanloup, 537, 540, 541
- Duprat, 331, 332
- Durandus, 218
- Dürer, Albert, 298
- Dutch, missionary efforts, 452, 584
- Dutch Reformed Church, the, in America, 477. See, also, Reformed Church
- Dutch Republic, the, rise of, 344, 345
- Dwight, Timothy, 562, 613, 664
- EASTER, observance of, in the early Church, 64, 65; manner of celebration, 119; difference in reckoning time of, 119; derivation of the name, 145; custom of the British Church in regard to, 148

- Eastern Empire, injured by Moslem conquests, 176
 Eastern sects submit to the Roman see, 262
 Eber, Paul, 422
 Eberhard, 198
 Ebionites, 74; the Essenian, 75
 Ecclesiastical courts, 100, 156
 Ecclesiastical law, rise of, 109, 155
 Ecclesiastical Reservation, the, 317, 318, 393, 408
 Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, the, 552
 Eck, John, 293, 294
 Edessa, the planting of the Church in, 45; fall of, 188
 Edmund, Prince of England, 199
 Edward I., of England, 240, 241. III., statutes of, 249. VI., his reign, 357 *seq.*
 "Edwardeans," the, 612
 Edwards, Jonathan, 520, 525, 526, 611, 612, 650
 Edwards, Jonathan, Jr., 613, 616
 Edwards, Mrs., on Whitefield, 525
 Edwin, K. of Northumberland, 147
 Egède, Hans, 585
 Egidius de Colonna, 244
 Egidius, Dr. John, 390
 Egmont, Count, 342, 343, 344
 Egypt, progress of Christianity in, 45
 Eichhorn, 621, 622
 Elagabalus, 49
 Eldership, the, in the early Church, 35, 36
 Eliot, John, 467, 584
 Elipandus, 178, 179
 Elizabeth of England, 338; her character, 362, 363, 393; her relations with the papacy, 362; obliged to help the Scottish Calvinists, 365, 366; relations with Mary Stuart, 365 *seq.*; her religious policy, 368 *seq.*; excommunicated by Pius V., 370; her warfare with Spain, 370, 371, 399; her attitude towards Episcopacy, 374; compels the clergy to use vestments, 377, 380
 Elkesaites, 75
 Ellis, William, 596
 Emancipation of slaves, 232, 660, 661
 Embury, Philip, 576
 Emerson, R. W., 617
 Emmons, Nathaniel, 613
 Encyclopædists, the, 619
 Endicott, John, 464, 470
 England, early connection of, with the see of Rome, 149; resists the papacy, 249, 252; characteristics of the early literature of, 278; the Renaissance in, 282, 283; the Reformation in, its political character, 346; parties connected with, 352, 353; a reaction sets in, 355, 357; repressed under Mary, 359 *seq.*; gradually restored by Elizabeth, 368, 369; the Anabaptists in, 426; "enthusiasm" and Quakerism in, 490; religious parties in, in the eighteenth century, 509 *seq.*; dissenters oppressed in, 510, 511; low condition of religion and morals in, 511, 512, 513; Catholic emancipation in, 535; later religious history of, 549 *seq.*; missionary zeal of, 452, 585 *seq.*
 England, the Church of, throws off its allegiance to Rome, 349, 350; reorganized under Henry VIII., 350, 351; draws up its formularies, 357, 358; Episcopacy in, during the first age of the Reformation, 373 *seq.*; rise of sacerdotalism in, 379, 380; Hooker's view of, 419; Arnold's view, *ib.*; Warburton's view, *ib.*; Coleridge's view, *ib.*; Gladstone's early view, *ib.*; Barrowe on, 461; Roger Williams on, 470; parties in, in the eighteenth century, 509, 510; its missions, 586; religious movements in, 550, 630 *seq.*
 Ennodius, 108
 Enzo, 199
 Ephesians, the Epistle to the, 29, 43
 Ephesus, council of, 133, 135
 Ephraem Syrus, 121, 124
 Epictetus, 12
 Epicurus, 11
 Epiphanius, 123
 Epiphany, origin of, 65; later observance of, 118, 119
 Episcopacy, the rise of, in the early Church, 51 *seq.*; at the outset a governmental arrangement, 54; in the "Catholic" Church, 57; in England during the first age of the Reformation, 373 *seq.*; Smalcaldic Articles on, 373; Melancthon on, *ib.*; the Swiss divines on, *ib.*; the Thirty-nine Articles on, *ib.*; Jewel's view of, 374; Cranmer on, 374; Dean Field and Ussher on, *ib.*, 379; attitude of Elizabeth towards, *ib.*; the Act of Uniformity on, 375; Whitgift on, 378; Hooker on, *ib.*, 379; Wake on, 379; Jeremy Taylor on, 380; feeling of the Puritans towards, 394, 397; Laud on, 403; Milton on, 434; imposed on Scotland, 554; the Latitudinarian view of, 598. See, also, Bishops
 Episcopalianism, the, in Virginia, 475; in Maryland, 478; in Scotland, 489; under Cromwell, 484, 485; in America, after the Revolution, 559, 565 *seq.*
 Episcopius, 429, 462, 600, 621
 "Epistolæ obscurorum virorum," 282
 "Epitome," 74
 Erasmus, in England, 232, 283, 284; his early life, 283; his writings and opinions, 283 *seq.*; at Basel, 284; extent of his influence, 285; ground of his fame, 286; his manner of writing, *ib.*; purpose of his life, *ib.*; friendly to Luther, 293, 294, 295; his controversy with Luther, 303, 304; Holbein's picture of, 304; Gardiner's remark on, 353; a leading Catholic writer, 435; on missions 451
 Erastianism, 417
 Ermenberga, 211
 Erskine, Ebenezer, 554
 Erskine, Thomas, of Linlathen, 632

- Eschatology, recent views on, 640. See, also, Heaven, etc.
 Eskimos, the, 595
 "Essays and Reviews," the, 550
 Essenes, the, 15, 111
 Essex, the Earl of, 395, 406
 Established Church of Scotland, 587, 590
 Ethelbert, 147.
 Ethics, Butler on, 609, 610; Price on, 610; Paley, Hutcheson, and Adam Smith on, *ib.*; Edwards on, 612; of Kant, 623
 Ethiopic Church, the, rise of, 134
 Eucharist, the term, 63. See, also, Lord's Supper
 Euchites, the, 114
 Eudoxia, 124
 Eugene III., 188, 214. IV., 261, 262, 263, 289
 Eugénie, 541
 Eusebians, 131
 Eusebius of Cæsarea, 79, 88, 117; his career, 123; his history, 128; on the proofs of Christianity, 139
 Eusebius of Nicomedia, 130
 Eutyches, 134
 Evagrius, the historian, 128
 Evangelical Alliance, the, 662
 Ewald, Charles, 622, 623
 Excommunication, 231
 Exorcists, 55
 Ezra, 14

 FABER, F. W., 631, 664
 Factory acts, the, 659
 Faith, early corruption of, 83; Augustine on, 140; must be supplemented by works, 141; the schoolmen on, 223; Reformers on, 423, 444; the Roman Catholics on, 444; Wesley on, 519; Locke on, 603, 604
 Faith and Reason, Scotus Erigena on, 180; Abelard on, 213; St. Bernard on, 214; Anselm on, 219; Hugo of St. Victor on, *ib.*
 "Falk Laws," the, 539
 Fall, the, Augustine and Pelagius on, 136; the schoolmen on, 220; Calvin on, 321; Flacius on, 424; the Reformers on, 441; the Arminians on, 441; Swedenborg on, 508. See, also, Sin
 False decretals, the, 169
 Familists, the, 427
 Faraday, 645
 Farel, William, at Geneva, 323, 324, 331, 421
 Fasting, 62, 64, 118, 119, 468, 487
 Fathers, the, 68 *seq.*; the Apostolic, 69; the Greek, 122 *seq.*; the Latin, 125 *seq.*; neglected by the schoolmen, 215; renewed study of, 279
 "Faust," 642
 Faustus, Bp. of Rhegium, 138
 Febronius, 504
 Federalism in theology, 428, 441, 610
 Felicitas, an early martyr, 48
 Felix V., anti-pope, 263
 Felix, Bp. of Urgel, 178
 Fénelon, 436, 495, 496
 Ferdinand, Emp. H. R. E., 297, 310, 314, 408
 Ferdinand the Catholic, 268, 296, 389
 Ferdinand VII., K. of Spain, 534
 Ferdinand of Styria, 408, 409
 Ferry, Jules, 541, 544
 Feudalism, 174, 175
 Fichte, 625
 Ficino, 280, 281
 Field, Dean, 374, 379
 Fiji Islands, 597
 "Filioque" clause, the, 131
 Finney, Charles G., 614, 615
 Fisher, Bp., 353
 Fitz Urse, Reginald, 351
 Five Mile Act, the, 487
 Flacius, Matthias, 424
 Flaminio, 385, 391
 Flavianus, Bp. of Antioch, 101
 Flavianus, Bp. of Constantinople, 134
 Fletcher, John, 519
 Florence, Council of, 223, 262
 Florus Magister, 179
 Flotte, Peter, 242
 "Form of Concord," the, 408, 424
 "Formula Consensus Helvetica," 428, 439
 Foster, John, 628, 640
 "Four Articles of Prague," the, 260
 Fox, George, 490, 491
 France during the great schism, 251 *seq.*; adopts the reforms of Basel, 262; characteristics of the early literature of, 278; the *Reformation* in, emanated from Humanism, 330; promoted by Lefèvre, 331; two parties in the court, 331, 332; attitude of Francis toward, 332; becomes Calvinistic, 334; progress and organization of, *ib.*; supported by the great nobles, 335; attacked by the Catholics, 337; ceases to progress, 347
 France, gains of, in the Thirty Years' War, 411; Presbyterianism in, 418; the Jesuits expelled from, 502; revolution in, 528; clerical reaction in, 534, 535; Church of the Huguenots in, 542 *seq.*
 Francis II., Emp. H. R. E., 505
 Francis I., of France, at Marignano, 270; an aspirant for the imperial crown, 296; captured at Pavia, 298; and Charles V., 304, 305, 314, 348; addressed by Calvin, 320; fosters the Renaissance, 330; his attitude toward the Reformation, 332; persecutes the Protestants, 333. II., 335, 336
 Francis, St., 167, 205, 206
 Francis of Sales, 436
 Franciscans, the order of, constituted, 195, 206; schism among, 207; become schoolmen, 210; on the Lord's Supper, 225; promoters of Mariolatry, 226; against John XXII., 246; the Spiritual, 272; in India, 449; in Mexico, 456; in Paraguay, 457; in North America, *ib.*, 458; complain of the Jesuit missionaries, 500

- Francke, A. H., 506, 584, 585
 Frankfort, troubles among the Reformers at, 376
 Franklin, Benjamin, 520
 Franklin College, 574
 Franks, the, 96, 155, 156, 158, 168
Frates Poloni, the, 431
 Fratricelli, the, 207
 Frederic I., of Denmark, 311. IV., 584
 Frederic II., of Prussia, 498, 503, 620
 Frederic William II., 503. III., 546. IV., 539, 547
 Frederick I. (Barbarossa), Emp. H.R.E., his aspirations, 189; contest with the papacy, 189 *seq.*; his death, 191. II., made emperor, 193; restores order in the empire, 195; starts on the fifth crusade, 196; his contest with the papacy, 196 *seq.*; his character, 198; his death, 199
 Frederick, the Elector, 280, 293 *seq.*, 394. III., 427
 Frederick of Austria, 257
 Free Church of Scotland, 556, 587
 Free-will Baptists, the, 564
 "Friends of God," the, 277
 Friesland, West, spread of Christianity to, 150
 Frisians, the, 146, 151
 Frith John, 347, 353
 Froben, 284, 286
 Fry, Elizabeth, 657, 658
 Fulda, monastery of, 151
 Fuller, Andrew, 586, 628
 Future state, the Reformers on, 448; Tillotson on, 599. See, also, Eschatology, Heaven, etc.
 GALATIANS, the Epistle to the, 27
 Gale, John, 523
 Gale, Theophilus, 599, 603
 Galerius, 50, 87
 Galileo, 412, 437
 Gall, St., 150
 Gallic creeds, the, 427
 Gallicanism, 202, 254, 270, 271, 272, 330, 494, 530, 535, 542
 Gallienus, 50
 Gallus, 49
 Gamaliel, 20
 Gambetta, 541
 Gardiner, Thomas, 353, 355, 359
 Garfield, J. A., 565
 Garibaldi, 537
 Garnier, 459
 Garrison, W. L., 661
 Gasparin, Count, 543
 Gaul, founding of churches in, 45
 Gavazzi, 545
 Genesis, Luther on its Mosaic authorship, 439
 Genseric, 95
 Geneva, the Reformation in, 323 *seq.*; banishes Calvin, 324; recalls him, 325; ecclesiastical and civil order at, under Calvin, 325; burns Servetus, 327; its influence, 328, 334, 335, 341; Church and State in, 417, 418; worship in, 421
 Genoa, commercial fall of, 288
 George of Saxony, Duke, 294
 George, David, 427
 Gerbert (Sylvester II.), 172, 179
 "German Theology," the, 277
 Gerhard, Paul, 422
 Germanic law, its influence on Anselm's doctrine of the atonement, 231
 Germans, the early, characteristics of, 145; religion of, *ib.*; conversion of, *ib.*, 146, 149; at Constance, 259; leave the University of Prague, 275; religious feeling of, 289, 290
 Germany, establishment of Christianity in, 46; supports Clement VII. (schismatic), 251; adopts the reforms of Basel, 262; declares the German Church neutral, *ib.*; restores its obedience to Eugenius IV., 263; characteristics of the early literature of, 278; Renaissance in, 281, 282; condition of, at the beginning of the Reformation, 295; Catholic reaction in, 393; ecclesiastical reforms in, in the eighteenth century, 505; Roman Catholic Church in, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, 531; its relations with the papacy, 539, 540; later religious condition of, 546; missionary activity in, 588
 Gerson, 254, 255, 259
 Ghengis Khan, 166
 Ghent, pacification of, 345
 Ghibellines, 188, 193, 240
 Gibbon, Edward, 122, 513, 607
 Gibbons, Abp., 581
 Gieseler, 627
 Giessen, University of, 442
 Gilbert, Bishop of Poitiers, 214
 Gioberti, 544
 Girard will case, the, 561
 Gladstone, 419, 539, 551, 552
 Glanvil, 480, 481
 Glasgow Missionary Society, 587
 Gnosticism, 75 *seq.*; aim of, 76, 78; influence of, in the growth of theology, 78
 Gobet, 529
 God, the being of, the Gnostics on, 75, 76; Marcion on, 77; the Apostolic Fathers on, 80; Mohammed on, 153; the Veronese on, 176; Spinoza on, 437, 438; Swedenborg on, 508
 God, proof of his being, Augustine on, 140; Boetius on, *ib.*; Anselm on, 219; the schoolmen on, 220; Melancthon on, 440; Calvin on, *ib.*; Des Cartes on, *ib.*; Locke on, 603; Clarke on, 604; Kant on, 623; Coleridge on, 629
 God, relation of, to the world, Pelagius on, 136; Augustine on, *ib.*; Mohammed on, 153; Scotus Erigena on, 180; Spinoza on, 437, 438; Leibnitz on, 620; Goethe on, 642, 643
 Goethe, 642, 643
 Golden Bull, the, 295
 Gomar, 429
 Goodell, William, 592, 593
 Goodwin, John, 484

- Goodwin, Thomas, 434
 Gordian, 49
 Gordon, the missionary, 597
 Gorham case, the, 550
 Gospel, the power of, Justin Martyr on, 59; Origen on, *ib.*
 "Gospel of the Egyptians," 74
 "Gospel of the Hebrews," 74
 Goths, the East, 92, 93, 97
 Goths, the West, 92 *seq.*
 Gothic architecture, 235
 Gottschalk, chief of the Wends, 165
 Gottschalk, monk of Orbais, 179, 180
 Grace, Pelagius on, 136; Augustine on, *ib.*; Ambrose on, 137; Theodore of Mopsuestia on, *ib.*; Chrysostom on, *ib.*; Cassian on, 138; the schoolmen on, 222; Baxter on, 433; the Reformers on, 442; the Greeks and Roman Catholics on, 442
 Graf, 622
 Granville, 342, 343
 Gratian, 91, 93, 106
 Gratian, John (Gregory VI.), 172
 Grebel, 425, 426
 Greece, modern, 558
 Greek language and culture, influence of, 9, 13; renewed study of, 279
 Greek Church, attempts to reunite it to the Latin Church, 261, 262; and the Reformers, 412; on grace and predestination, 442. See, also, Church, Eastern
 Green, John Richard, 380
 Greenland, the spread of Christianity to, 164
 Greenwood, John, 460, 461
 Gregory I., his career, 146, 147, 157, 158; influence on music, 121; his writings, 129; on slavery, 232; on torture, 233. II., 150. III., 151, 158. IV., 168. V., 172. VI., 172. VII. (Hildebrand), his early career, 173, 174; made pope, 182; his character and aims, 182, 183; contest with Henry IV., 184 *seq.*; relations to William the Conqueror, 184; to Philip of France, *ib.*; his bull excommunicating Henry, 182; his death, 185; the friend of Matilda, 187. IX., his attainments, 195; conflict with Fred. II., 196 *seq.*; reorganizes the Inquisition, 205; his death, 198. X., 200. XI., 250. XII., 253 *seq.* XIII., 370, 556. XV., 412. XVI., 535
 Gregory, "The Illuminator," 98
 Gregory of Nazianzus, 102, 113; a great preacher, 120; his career, 123; influence in establishing the Nicene theology, 131; on councils, 135; rejects the Apocalypse, 139; a restorationist, 143
 Gregory of Nyssa, a great preacher, 120; his career, 123; influence in establishing the Nicene theology, 131; a restorationist, 143
 Gregory of Rimini, 236
 Gregory of Tours, 129, 160
 Grey, Lady Jane, 359
 Griesbach, 621
 Grindal, 376
 Griswold, Bp., 569
 Gropper, 314
 Grosteste, Robert, 202
 Grotius, Hugo, imprisoned, 407; advocates the "territorial system," 417; an Arminian leader, 429; on John Selden, 434; on tradition, 438; method of interpretation, 439; on the atonement, 443, 444, 638
 Guelfs, the, 188, 193
 Guibert of Nogent, 237
 Guibert, Abp. of Paris, 541
 Guiscard, Robert, 174, 185
 Guizot, 543, 544
 Gundobald, 97
 Gunpowder Plot, the, 398
 Gustavus Adolphus, 403, 410, 411, 478
 Guyon, Madame, 436, 496
 HACON, 164
 Hades, the Apostolic Fathers on, 85, doctrine of, in Period III., 142; the Reformers on, 448; in the Authorized Version, 448. See, also, Hell
 Hadrian, Roman emp., 47
 Hadrian II., Pope, 170. IV., 188; lays Rome under the interdict, 189; contest with Fred. I., 189; his Irish bull, 381; his death, 190. VI., 348
 Hagenbach, 627
 Haldane, James, 555
 Haldane, Robert, 555
 Hale, Sir Matthew, 432
 Hales, Alexander of, 215, 225
 Hales, John, 600
 "Half-way covenant," the, 524
 Hall, Gordon, 590
 Hall, Joseph, 379, 402, 434
 Hall, Robert, 434, 524, 623
 Halley, Robert, 553
 Hamilton, Patrick, 364
 Hamilton, Sir William, 633
 Hampden, Bp. of Hereford, 550
 Hampton Court Conference, the, 397
 Hanseatic League, 311
 Hardwick, Charles, 372
 Hare, Julius, 632
 Harms, Claus, 547
 Harnack, A., 54, 84
 Harold, Prince of Jutland, 163
 Harold of England, 230
 Hartmann, 634
 Hase, 628
 Hassun, 559
 Harvard University, origin of, 467
 Hawaiian Evangelical Association, 597
 Heaven, the Apostolic Fathers on, 85; Mohammed on, 153
 Heber, Reginald, 590, 664
 Hebrew, renewed study of, 281
 Hebrews, the Epistle to, 43, 79, 139, 436
 Heck, Barbara, 576
 Hefele, 537, 538
 Hegel, 290, 625
 Hegesippus, 71
 Heidelberg Catechism, the, 427
 Heidelberg, University of, 280
 Heine, on Luther's hymn, 422

- Helena, wife of Constantine, 87
 Hell, the Apostolic Fathers on, 85; Mohammed on, 153; the schoolmen on, 226; in the Authorized Version, 448. See, also, Eschatology, etc.
 Hellenists, the, 14
 Heloise, 212, 213
 Helvetic Confession, the, 427
 Helvetius, 619
 Helwys, 426
 Henry III., Emp. H. R. E., 172, 173. IV., 174; his contest with Gregory VII., 184 *seq.*; his death, 186. V., 186, 187. VI., 192. VII., 245, 246
 Henry I. of England, 186, 211. II., 190, 191, 202, 351, 381. III., 199, 202, 231. IV., 274. V., 274. VII., 266, 283, 347. VIII., in European politics, 269, 270; favors the new learning, 283; controversy with Luther, 302; receives the title of Defender of the Faith, 302; Bacon's description of, 347; his political position, *ib.*; his foreign policy, *ib.*, 348; seeks a divorce, 348; declared the head of the Church in England, 349; marries Anne Boleyn, *ib.*; throws off allegiance to the papacy, *ib.*, 350; his ecclesiastical power, 350, 351; a persecuter, 353; inclined towards the Protestants, 354; suppresses the monasteries, *ib.*, 355; disgraces Cromwell, 355; his later years, 356; his order of succession, 359; value of his policy, 369; attempts to plant Protestantism in Ireland, 382
 Henry II. of France, 317, 334. III., 339, 340. IV., 338 *seq.*, 407, 410, 411
 Henry, Prince of Orange, 429
 Henry of Clugny, 424
 Henry, Patrick, 560, 660
 Heraclius, 101
 Herbert, George, 422
 Herbert, Lord, of Cherbury, 602
 Herder, 623
 Heresies, effect of, on the early Church, 53
 Hermann, Abp. of Cologne, 358
 Hermas, 69
 Hermias, 71
 Hermits, the, 111 *seq.*
 Herod, 13
 Herod Agrippa I., 14, 21
 Hicks, Elias, 579
 "Hicksite Quakers," 579
 Hidéyoshi, 455
 Hierarchy, growth of, in the first three centuries, 56, 104
 Hierocracy, period of, 14
 Higginson, Francis, 464
 High Church party, the, 380, 510, 550, 631
 High Commission, Court of, 369, 403, 460, 461, 470, 489
 Hilary of Arles, 107
 Hilary of Poitiers, 121, 125
 Hildebrand. See Gregory VII.
 Hilgenfeld, 625
 Hill, George, 611
 Hincmar, 170, 179, 180
 Hinduism, 589
 Hippolytus, 73
 Hoadley, Bp., 512, 514
 Hobart, J. H., 569
 Hobbes, Thomas, 598, 602
 Hodge, Charles, 614
 Hohenstaufens, the, ruin of, 199
 Holbach, 619
 Holbein, 304, 355
 Holland, independence of acknowledged, 411; late religious condition of, 545, 546
 Holliman, 472
 Holy League (in Italy), the, 269
 Holy League of Nuremberg, 314
 Holy Roman Empire, origin of, 171; loses its power, 200; revives, 246; weakened by the Peace of Westphalia, 410
 Holy Spirit, the Apostolic Fathers on, 81; the Council of Toledo on, 131; the Council of Constantinople on, 132; the Nicene Creed on, *ib.*
 Holy Spirit, work of, Augustine on, 136, 137; Arminians on, 429; the Reformers on, 440; Ann Hutchinson on, 473; Quakers on, 491; Swedenborg on, 509; Tillotson on, 599
 Homburg Synod, the, 415
 Honorius, Roman emp., 94, 107
 Honorius I., Pope, 135. III., 195, 205
 Honorius II., anti-pope, 174
 Hontheim, Nicholas von, 504
 Hoogstraten, 282
 Hooker, Richard, on the eucharist, 371; on Calvin's influence, 372; on predestination, 373; his "Ecclesiastical Polity," 378; on Calvin's polity, 379; on Church and State in England, 419; as a theologian, 431; on baptism, 447; on the Lord's Day, 448
 Hooker, Thomas, 464, 467
 Hooper, 360; his objections to vestments, 376; the father of Puritanism, 377
 Hopkins, Samuel, 612, 613, 651
 Hopkinsians, the, 562, 612
 Horn, Count, 344
 Horsley, Bp., 615
 Hosius, at Nicea, 130
 Hospitallers, the, 196, 208
 Howard, John, 656, 657
 Howe, John, 431, 601
 Hugh Capet, 172
 Hughes, John, 581
 Hugo of St. Victor, 214, 219
 Hugo, Victor, 644
 Huguenots, the French Protestants called, 336; massacred at Vassy, 337; on St. Bartholomew's Day, 339; protected by the Edict of Nantes, 340; assisted by Elizabeth, 363, 370; protected by Cromwell, 485; persecution of, in the seventeenth century, 493; their later history, 542, 543; in America, 570
 Humanists, the, 280, *seq.*; Italian, 280, 281; German, 281, 282; English, 282, 283; their classicism, 286; and Luther 295; in England, 346

- Humanitarianism, 81
Humbert de Romanis, 237
Hume, David, 602, 607 *seq.*
Hungary, the conversion of, 164; church in, subject to Roman see, 165; the Reformation in, 313, 314; Catholic reaction in, 393
Huns, the, 93, 95
Hunt, Robert, 475
Huntingdon, Lady, 520, 522
Hupfeld, 622, 628
Hurons, the, 453, 459
Huss, John, his work in Bohemia, 275; at Constance, 258, 276; effect of his death on Bohemia, 260; Luther's remarks upon, 294, 297
Hussites, the, 260. See, also, Utraquists
Hutcheson, Francis, 610
Hutchinson, Ann, 472, 473, 477
Hutchinson, Colonel, memoir of, 395
Hutchinson, Mrs. Colonel, on the spirit and aims of Charles I., 400
Hutton, Abp. of York, 372, 373
Hyacinthe, Père, 539
Hymnology, early, 121; mediæval, 238; among the Protestants, 421, 422, 423; recent, 663, 664
Hyrcanus II., 13
- ICELAND, the spread of Christianity to, 164
Iconoclastic controversy, 158
Ignatius of Antioch, 47, 80, 84
Ignatius, Patriarch of Constantinople, 177
Illuminism, 497
Images, use of, 63; worship of, 117; controversy about, 158
Immaculate conception, doctrine of, 226, 537
Immersion, 41, 426, 435
Immortality, the Socinians on, 431
Imputation, 428, 441
Incarnation, the, doctrine respecting, of the Gnostics, 76; of the Apostolic Fathers, 80; Schwenckfeld on, 426; recent views on, 637
In Cæna Domini, the bull, 392, 504
Independents, the rise of, 460 *seq.*; persecuted, 381; attitude of the Puritan Presbyterians toward, 406; gain the ascendancy in England, 406, 407, 484; the English, their creeds, 427; on the civil magistracy, 447; in Virginia, 476; the English, in the eighteenth century, 523; later history of, in England, 553, 553; their missionaries, 586
"Index," the, 390
"Index Expurgatorius," 390
India, spread of Christianity to, 45, 98; Catholic missions in, 449, 452, 453, 583; Protestant missions in, 589, 590, 591
Indians, the, how treated by the colonists, 463, 478, 584
Indulgences, origin of, 160; the schoolmen on, 225; plenary, *ib.*; Luther on, 292
Infallibility of the pope, sanctioned by Aquinas, 223; Occam against, 271; decreed by the Vatican Council, 537
Infants. See Baptism
Innocent I., claims judicial authority in Africa, 106; against the Pelagians, 137, 114, 214. III., his idea of the papacy, 192; builds up the papal power in Italy, *ib.*; his relations with the empire, 193; with Philip Augustus, *ib.*; with John of England, *ib.*; starts the fourth crusade, *ib.*; proclaims a crusade against the Albigenses, 194; on taxation of clergy, 201; countenances the plan of St. Dominic, 205; of St. Francis, 206; sanctions doctrine of transubstantiation, 225; forbids miracle plays in the churches, 239; his death, 195. IV., his contest with Fred. II., 198, 199; seeks the ruin of the Hohenstaufens, 199; controversy with Grosteste, 202; sanctions use of torture, 233. VII., 253. VIII., 266, 480. X., 412, 494, 500. XI., 494. XII., 494
Inquisition, the, origin of, 194; reorganized in Italy, 389, 390; established in Spain, 389, 390, 391; in the Netherlands, 342, 343; and Galileo, 437; restored in Italy, 533; in modern Spain, 531, 534
Inspiration, doctrine of in the early Church, 78, 79; in Period III., 139; Theodore of Mopsuestia on, *ib.*; Chrysostom on, *ib.*; the Reformers on, 439; recent views of, 635, 636
Interdict, the, 176, 231
Intermediate state, the, 142; the English divines on, 448; recent views on, 640
Interpretation, method of, 139, 140, 439, 503
Investiture, the struggle about, 183 *seq.*
Iona, monastery of, 114, 146, 148
Ireland, receives Christianity, 96; the attempts to plant Protestantism in, 381, 383
Irenæus, 41, 45, 46, 67; his career and opinions, 73, 82 *seq.*
Irene, the empress, 159
Irving, Edward, 555
Iroquois, the, 457 *seq.*
Isabella of Castile, 389, 451
Isidore, primate of Russia, 556
Isidore of Seville, 129, 161
Islam, 152. See, also, Mohammedanism
Italy, characteristics of the early literature of, 278; Renaissance in, 278, 280; attitude of toward the papacy in the sixteenth century, 383; advance of Protestantism into, 384; the Reformation in, checked, 389; the Catholic reaction in, *ib.*, 390; the unification of, 536, 537, 544, 545
Ives, Bp., 580
Ivry, battle of, 340
Iyeyasû, 455, 456
- JABLONSKI, 506
Jacobi, 624
Jacobite Church, the rise of, 184
Jacobus de Benedictis, 238

- James, the brother of John, 18, 21, 33
 James, the Lord's brother, 21, 22, 32
 James, Epistle of, 43, 79, 438, 439
 James I. of England (VI. of Scotland), his birth and coronation, 367; his attempt to introduce episcopacy in Scotland, 368, 396, 397, 399; his character, 396; thwarts the Puritans, 397; receives the adulation of the sacerdotalists, 398; his policy toward Roman Catholics, *ib.*; his foreign policy, 399; his "Declaration," 403; his divisive policy, 407; sends representatives to Dort, 429; burns Suarez's work on English heresies, 436. II., 433, 488, 489, 490, 492
 James V., of Scotland, 356, 363
 James Stuart, the Earl of Murray, 365, 397, 396
 Jansenists, the origin of, 436; conflict with the Jesuits, 436
 Jansenius, 412, 436
 Japan, Xavier in, 454; other Jesuits in, 455; Christians persecuted in, *ib.*, 456; the Portuguese in, 456; later Roman Catholic missionaries in, 583; Protestant missions in, 592
 Jefferson, Thomas, 469, 560, 660
 Jeffreys, 433, 489
 Jerome, an upholder of celibacy of clergy, 101; advocates the cloister life, 114; against Jovinian, 116; his career, 125; on the canon, 139
 Jerome of Prague, 258, 276; effect of his death on Bohemia, 260
 Jerusalem, conference at, 22, 23; fall of, 32; church at, 38; raised to the rank of a patriarchate, 105; captured by the Saracens, 154; by the crusaders, 186; by Saladin, 191; recovered by Frederick II., 196; final loss of, 201; Protestant missionaries in, 592, 593
 Jesuits, the origin of, 386, 387; organization of, 387; their work, 388; their wide influence, 393, 408, 409; in Sweden, 312; in Poland, 313; in France, 338; cause conflicts in the Roman Church, 394; their intrigues in the Greek Church, 412; as missionaries, 452 *seq.*, 533; in Paraguay, 457, 501; in Canada, 458; among the Iroquois, 459; against the Mystics, 495; the Jansenists, 496; downfall of, 499 *seq.*; their doctrines in morals, 499, 500; conduct of their missionaries, 500; their interference in political affairs, 501; restoration of, 503, 533; activity of, 534, 535, 537, 544; broken up in France, 541; in Switzerland, 548; in Tahiti, 596
 Jesus, birth, 8; born at a crisis, 13; baptism, 17; his ministry, *ib.*; his expectation of death, 18; his resurrection, 18; the relation of his teaching to the Jewish law, 23, 23; belief of the early Church regarding, 42. See, also, Christ.
 Jewel, Bp., 371, 374, 376, 378, 431, 480
 Jews, the, their spiritual superiority, 13; their dispersion, 14; unyielding faith in their religion, *ib.*; their Messianic hope, 16, 17; in the middle ages, 167, 168; as philosophers, 218; persecuted for apostasy in Spain, 389; tolerated in New York, 477; in Denmark, 547; in Sweden, *ib.*; in England, 551
 Joachim, the Abbot, 215
 Joan of Kent, 361
 John, the Apostle, 18, 32; character of his teaching, 42; Epistles and Gospel of, 32, 43
 John the Baptist, 17
 John, "the Presbyter," 32
 John VIII., 171. XII., 171. XV., 172, 176. XXII., his contest with Louis of Bavaria, 246; his errors, *ib.*, 248; death, 248. XXIII., calls the Council of Constantine, 256; deposed, 257
 John, of England, 193, 249
 John III., of Sweden, 312
 John of Damascus, 161, 162
 John of Gaunt, 273
 John à Lasco, 313
 John of Paris, 244
 John of Salisbury, 215
 John the Steadfast, Elector of Saxony, 301, 305, 315, 316, 394
 John of Zúpolya, 314
 Johnson, Francis, 461
 Johnson, Dr. Samuel, 513, 577, 606
 Johnson, Samuel, 565
 Joliet, 459
 Joris, 427
 Joseph, the husband of Mary, 17
 Joseph of Arimathea, 33, 89
 Joseph II., Emp. H. R. E., 504, 505
 Joseph Emanuel I., of Portugal, 501
 Jouffroy, 634
 Jovian, 91
 Jovinian, 116
 Jubilees, papal, 242, 252, 263
 Judaism, the Alexandrian, 15
 Judaizing Christians, 24, 25, 27, 33, 74
 Judas, the brother of Jesus, 33
 Jude, Epistle of, 43, 438
 Judea, 14
 Judson, Adoniram, 587, 588, 590, 591
 Julian, the "Apostate," 90, 91, 101, 138
 Julian of Eclanum, 137
 Julian de' Medici, 265
 Julius I., 105, 106, 131. II., 268, 269, 347. III., 317
 Justification, Paul's view, 26; the schoolmen on, 222; Schwenckfeld on, 426; the Reformers on, 444; the Roman Catholics on, 444; the Arminians on, 444; the Quakers on, 492; Swedenborg on, 509
 Justin I., 134
 Justin Martyr, 46, 48, 70, 71, 78, 82, 84, 85
 Justinian, 78, 97, 98, 107, 108, 134, 141
 KABBALA, the Jewish, 218, 281, 282
 Kadijah, 152
 Kamehameha I., 596. II., 596
 Kant, Immanuel, 622, 623
 Karens, the, 591

- Keble, John, 379, 550, 630, 664
 Ken, Bp., 663
 Kennet, 484
 Kenosis controversy, the, 442, 637
 Kenrick, Abp., 537
 Kent, spread of Christianity to, 147
 Kiernander, 589
 Kingsley, Charles, 515
 Knights' War, the, 300
 Knighthood, 186, 207
 Knox, John, influenced by Calvin, 328;
 his early career, 364; refuses an Eng-
 lish bishopric, *ib.*; an exile, *ib.*; his re-
 turn, 365, his conflict with Mary Stuart,
 366; his work in Scotland, 367, 368; at
 Frankfort, 376; prepares a liturgy, 421;
 on the Lord's Day, 418; his last days,
 396
 Koran, the, 153, 414
 Koreishites, the, 152
 Krauth, Charles P., 575
 Kuenen, 546, 622
 Kuyper, 546

 LA CHAISE, 493
 Lacordaire, 535, 644
 Ladislas, of Naples, 251, 255
 Lafayette, 660
 Lalemant, 459
 Lambert, Francis, 415
 Lambeth Articles, the, 372, 382, 398
 Lamennais, 535
 Lanfranc, 209; his career, 211; on tran-
 substantiation, 225
 Langland, William, 278
 Languages, the national, growth of, 278
 Laodiceans, epistle to the, 162
 Laplace (Placcus), 428
 Lardner, N., 513, 608
 Las Casas, Bartholomew de, 450, 451
 Lasco, John à, 313
 Lateran, Fourth Council of the, 194; Fifth
 Council of the, 268 *seq.*; its decree on
 immortality, 281
 Latimer, 353, 355, 360, 431
 Latin language and culture, influence of,
 9; renewed study of, 279
 Latin, use of in the church service, 163,
 237
 Latin empire at Constantinople, creation
 of, 194; fall of, 201
 Latitudinarians, the, 598 *seq.*
 Laud, William, 379, 380; his career and
 opinions, 402; his tyrannical proceed-
 ings, 403, 404, 464; his prayer for Buck-
 ingham, 405; influence on Chilling-
 worth, 600; beheaded, 404
 Lauderdale, 487
 Lavalette, 502
 Law. See Ecclesiastical Law
 Law, William, 513, 514, 605, 655
 Lazarists, the, 583
 Lazarus, 33
 Lecky, 483
 Le Clerc, 429, 621
 Lectors, 56
 Lefèvre, Jacques, 319; his career, 331
 Legnano, Battle of, 191
 Leibnitz, 497; his career, 619, 620
 Leicester, the Earl of, 377
 Leighton, Robert, 432
 Leipsic, disputation at, 293, 294; Univer-
 sity of, founded, 275
 Leipsic Interim, the, 317
 Leo I., the Great, Pope, protects Rome,
 95; and the Council of Chalcedon, 106,
 107, 134; and the East Illyrian bishops,
 107; his writings, 128. II., 135. III.,
 159, 160. VIII., 172. IX., 173. X., his
 character, 269; his papal policy, 270;
 condemns the "Epistles," 282; and Lu-
 ther, 293; alliance with Charles V., 297,
 298; his death, 298. XII., 534, 535.
 XIII., 540, 548
 Leo III., Roman emperor, 158
 Leopold II., Emp. H. R. E., 505
 Leopold, of Tuscany, 505
 Leslie, Charles, 603
 Lessing, 621
 "Leviathan," the, 602
 Leyden, the English Independents at,
 462
 L'Hospital, 336, 337
 Libanius, 90
 Licinius, 50
 Lightfoot, Bp., 51, 54
 Lightfoot, John, 432, 433
 Limborch, 429
 Limbus infantum, 226; patrum, *ib.*
 Literature (see Table of Contents, under
 Doctrine) modern, spirit of, 641
 Liturgies, growth of, 120; the mediæval,
 237; the English, 358; Protestant, 419
 seq.; in the Catholic Apostolic Church,
 555. See, also, Prayer Book
 Livingstone, David, 594
 Livonians, the, conversion of, 165; the
 Reformation among, 313
 Locke, John, 465, 603, 608
 Logos (see Christ), 81, 82, 84
 Lollards, the, 274, 346
 Lombard, Peter, 214, 215, 223, 226
 Lombard League, the, 191, 195
 Lombards, the, 97, 158, 159, 188, 189, 197
 London Missionary Society, the, 586, 590,
 594, 595, 596
 Long Parliament, the, 403 *seq.*, 584
 Lord's Day, the early observance of, 40,
 64, 118; Westminster Creeds on, 406;
 Milton on, 435; the Reformers on, 448;
 in Puritan New England, 468
 Lord's Supper, early celebration of, 37,
 41, 66, 68; the Apostolic Fathers on,
 84; Harnack's remark on the early form
 of, *ib.*; later doctrine of, 142, 160;
 Ratramnus on, 179; the schoolmen on,
 224, 225; Luther on, 309; Zwingli on,
 ib.; Melancthon on, 315; in the Thirty-
 nine Articles, 358; English Reformers
 on, 371, 372; Laud on, 402; the Reform-
 ers on, 447; the Irvingites on, 555;
 Tractarians on, 630, 631
 Lorenzo de' Medici, 265, 266, 276
 Lothair, Roman emp., 187
 Lothair II., 170
 Lotze, 634

- Louis, the Pious, Roman emp., 163, 168, 178
 Louis of Bavaria, Emp. H. R. E., 246, 248
 Louis IX., of France, 166; his crusades, 201; his death, *ib.*; his Pragmatic Sanction, 202; his character, 231; canonized, 241. XI., 265. XII., 267 *seq.* XIII., 401. XIV., 488, 493, 494, 496, 498, 500, 542. XVI., 528. XVIII., 534
 Louis Philippe, 528, 535
 Louis the German, 170
 Louis II., of Hungary, 314
 Louis of Anjou, 251
 Louis, Prince of Condé, 335 *seq.*
 Louis of Nassau, Count, 343
 Louise of Savoy, 331, 332
 Louvois, 493
 Love-feasts, 37, 40, 67
 Low Church party, the, ascendant, 509; later history of, 632
 Loyola, Ignatius, 386, 387, 412
 Lübeck, the Reformation at, 311
 Lucar, Cyril, 412
 Lucius I., Bp. of Rome, 49. II., Pope, 188
 Lücke, 627
 Lucretia Borgia, 267
 Luidger, 152
 Luitprand, 158
 Luke, 26; Gospel of, 43
 Lull, Raymond, 167, 217, 218
 Lullus, 151
 Luthardt, 628
 Luther, Martin, on his debt to Augustine, 127; his relations to Occam, 272; to Wessel, 276; to Savonarola, 277; to Tauler, 278, 291; the hero of the Reformation, 290; his early life, *ib.*, 291; his religious experience, 291; opposes Tetzel, *ib.*; his theses, 292; and Leo X., 293; disputation at Leipsic, 294; his "Address" and "Babylonian Captivity," 294; excommunicated, *ib.*; burns the papal bull, 295; at the Diet of Worms, 297; in the Wartburg, 298, 299; his translation of the Bible, 299; influence on the German tongue, *ib.*, 316; stops the trouble at Wittenberg, 299; relations with the Knights, 300; attitude toward the Peasants' revolt, 301; his marriage, *ib.*, 302; his writings, 302; controversy with Henry VIII., *ib.*; his controversy with Erasmus, 303, 304; Cranach's picture of, 304; his controversy with the Swiss on the Lord's Supper, 305, 309, 310; attitude toward the Diet of Augsburg, 305; countenances the League of Smalcald, 306; compared with Zwingli, 308, 309; his last days and death, 315; later relations with Melancthon, 315, 316; estimate of, 316; Coleridge and Döllinger on, 316; compared with Calvin, 320, 321, 322; his wide influence, 314, 346, 384; on the powers of the laity in Church affairs, 414; on Church and State, 415; on marriage, 416; prepares manuals of worship, 420; a hymn-writer, 421, 422; as a doctrinal teacher, 423; attacks Aristotle, 436; on the canon, 438, 439; on the human reason, 440; on the atonement, 443; on infant baptism, 446; on the Lord's Day, 448; his attitude toward missions, 451; his influence on Wesley, 516
 Lutheranism, how distinguished from Calvinism, 423
 Lutherans, the, called Protestants, 304; in Poland, 313; in Hungary, 314; in England, 352; their treatment of the exiles from England, 375; their intolerance, 408; their polity, 416; their ideas on worship, 419; their forms, 420; their festivals, *ib.*, 421; their doctrines, sources of, 423, 424; on the person of Christ, 442; on grace, *ib.*; on justification, 444; on perseverance, 445; on the Lord's Supper, 447; later history of, 546, 547; in U. S., 574, 575, 588
 Lütken, 584
 Lutzen, Battle of, 410
 Lybia, tribes of, spread of Christianity to, 98
 Lyons, Church in, 45, 48
 MACAULAY, 432, 485, 491
 Machiavelli, 281
 Mackemie, Francis, 571
 Mackintosh, 466, 603, 659
 Madagascar, Protestant missions in, 595
 Madaia, Francesco and Rosa, 545
 Madison, James, Bp. of Virginia, 568, 569
 Madison, James, President, 560
 Madrid, treaty of, 298
 Maffit, J. N., 578
 "Magdeburg Centuries," the, 435
 Magic, 229, 479
 Magister, Florus, 179
 Magistracy, the civil, its authority, the Reformers on, 447; the Independents and the Baptists on, *ib.*
 Magyars, the, 164
 Mahan, Asa, 614
 Maimonides, Moses, 218
 Maintenon, Madame de, 493
 Mair, John, 364
 "Malabar customs," the, 500, 582, 683
 Malan, César, 548
 Mallet, 606
 Man, nature of, the schoolmen on, 220; sinfulness of, the Reformers on, 441, 442. See, also, Adam, Sin
 Mandæans, 77
 Mandeville, B., 606
 Manfred, 199
 Mani, 77
 Manichæism, 77, 78; in France, 272
 Manning, Cardinal, 631
 Mansel, H. L., 633
 Mansfield, Lord, 660
 Marburg, conference at, 305, 310
 Marcion, 77, 79
 Marcus Aurelius, 12, 71, 92

- Margaret of Maultasch, 248
 Margaret of Navarre, 319, 331, 332, 335
 Margaret of Parma, 342, 343
 Mariana, 499
 Marignano, Battle of, 270
 Mark, Gospel of, 43
 Maronites, the, 135, 558, 592
 Marot, Clement, 334, 385, 421
 Marquesas Islands, 597
 Marquette, 429
 Marriage among the early Christians, 60, 62; the schoolmen on, 226; how looked upon by the Lutherans, 416; in Puritan New England, 467
 Marshall College, 575
 Marshman, 590
 Marsilio Ficino, 280
 Marsilius of Padua, 247, 271, 351
 Martin IV., 200, 240. V., 259, 260
 Martin, St., shrine of, 160
 Martyn, Henry, 593
 Martyr, Peter, his career in Italy, 385; flees from Italy, 339; in England, 358
 Martyrs, the early, number of, 50; increasing veneration of, 68
 Mary, the mother of Jesus, 17, 18; worship of, 118, 160, 226, 229, 230, 542
 Mary, "Bloody Queen," 548; restores Catholicism, 359; marries Philip II., 360; persecutes the Protestants, *ib.*; her loss of influence, 361, 362; her death, 362
 Mary Stuart, Q. of Scots, proposed marriage with Edward VI., 356, 357; married to the Dauphin of France, 335, 357, 365; heir to the Scottish throne, 363; death of her husband, 366; returns to Scotland, *ib.*; her conflict with Knox, *ib.*; her marriage with Darnley, *ib.*; with Bothwell, 367; abdicates, *ib.*; flees to England, *ib.*; her title to be recognized, 370; beheaded, 371
 Mary of Guise, 365
 Maryland, early laws of, 468; early religious policy of, 478
 Mason, John M., 573
 Massachusetts settled, 463, 464; political constitution, 524; repeals laws against Baptists, etc., 560; missionary zeal of, 584
 Masses, origin of the term, 66; for the dead, 160; private, 161; relation of transubstantiation to, 225, 309
 Mather, Cotton, 480, 482, 564
 Mather, Increase, 480
 Matilda, Countess of Tuscany, 187
 Matilda, mother of Otto I., 228
 Matthew, Gospel of, 43; received by the Ebionites, 75
 Matthew of Paris, 198
 Matthew, "Father," 662
 Matthias, the Apostle, 18, 19
 Matthias, Roman emp., 408
 Matthias of Janow, 275
 Maurice, Prince of Orange, 407, 429
 Maurice, Duke of Saxony, 315, 317, 393
 Maurice, F. D., 632, 640
 Maurus (St. Maur), 115
 Maurus, Rabanus, 179
 Maxentius, 87
 Maximilian, 50
 Maximilian I., Emp. H. R. E., 269, 293, 295, 296. II., 408
 Maximilian Joseph I., of Bavaria, 503
 Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, 408, 409
 Maximilian, "Emp. of Mexico," 541
 Maximinus, the Thracian, 49
 Maxwell, Clerk, 646
 May, 553
 Mayflower, the, 459, 463
 Mazarin, 485, 483
 Mazzini, 536, 544
 "McAll Mission," the, 544
 McMahon, 541
 Meade, William, 569
 Meaux, the Reformation at, 331
 Mediæval religion, characteristics of, 227, 228, 229; catholicism, 236
 Medici, the, 265, 269, 276, 277
 Mehemet Ali, 558
 Melancthon, Philip, 290; professor at Wittenberg, 294; draws up the Augsburg Confession, 305; at Ratisbon, 314; later relations with Luther, 315, 316; later view on the Lord's Supper, 315; his friendship for Calvin, 322, 324; approves the condemnation of Servetus, 327; urged to come to Paris, 333; to England, 354, 358; on Episcopacy, 373; his influence in Italy, 384; on Protestantism in Italy, 385; hated by the Lutherans, 408; and the Greek Church, 412; on connection of Church and State, 415; as an organizer, 416; as a doctrinal teacher, 423, 424; his manuals of instruction, 436; on the being of God, 440; on the Trinity, 441; influence in America, 576
 Melville, Andrew, 368, 396, 397, 399
 Mendicant orders, the, 204
 Menno Simonis, 426
 Mennonites, the, 426, 565
 Merit, idea of, 65, 227; the doctrine of salvation by, 225; treasury of, 225, 292; the Reformers on, 445
 Messiah, expectation of a, 16, 17
 Metaphrastes, Simeon, 181
 Metaphysics, modern, founded, 437
 Methodism, origin of, 513, 515 *seq.*; type of its preaching, 521; growth of, 522; effect of on Arminianism, 430
 Methodists, the origin of, 515 *seq.*; origin of the term, 516; organization of, 518; in U. S., 576; their missionaries, 586, 588, 591, 595, 597
 Methodius, 164
 Metropolitan bishops, 57, 104
 Metternich, 532
 Mexico, the Spanish in, 456; the Franciscans in, 456, 457; the Church of Rome in, 533
 Meyer, 627
 Michael III., 177
 Michael Angelo, 269, 288
 Michael Cæsararius, 177
 Michael of Cesena, 246

- Michaelis, 621
 Micronesian Islands, 597
 Middle ages, 175; characteristics of, 227
 Middleton, Conyers, 605
 Mikado, the, 455
 Mile Act, the, 487
 Militz, 274
 Mill, John Stuart, 608, 633
 Millenary Petition, the, 397
 Millennial kingdom, 84
 Mills, Samuel, 587
 Milman, 239, 632
 Milner, Joseph, 522
 Milnitz, 293
 Milton, John, 404, 434, 435
 Ministers, primitive parity of, 52
 Minutius Felix, 71
 Miracle plays, the, 239
 Miracles, definition of, 219; the Socinians on, 431; denied by the Deists, 602; Woolston's theory of, 605; Hume on, 607, 608; Paulus on, 623; Strauss on, 625, 626
 Miracles, mediæval, 146, 229
 Missions, the early Christian, 45 *seq.*; mediæval, 145 *seq.*, 163 *seq.*; in the first age of the Reformation, 449 *seq.*; modern, 582 *seq.*; obstacles to, 589; results of, 598
 "Moderates," the, 554, 555
 Modestus, 101
 Moehler, 538
 Moffat, Robert, 594
 Mohammed, his career, 152, 153; the flight of (Hegira), 152; his death, 153; his teaching, 153
 Mohammedanism, rise of, 152 *seq.*; rapid progress of, 154; in Spain, 166; in Persia, 167; mediæval hostility to, 231; later advance of, 449; in India, 589
 Mohammedans, the, attempts to convert, 167
 Molanus, 497
 Molina, 442
 Molinists, the, 442
 Molinos, 436; his career, 495
 Monarchianism, 81
 Monasteries, origin of, 113; multitude of, 234; suppressed in England, 354, 355; in France, 528; in Germany and Spain, 531
 Monasticism, sources of, 111; in the West, 114, 115; defences of, *ib.*, 116; decay of, 175; mediæval revival of, 203 *seq.*
 Mongols, the, attempts to convert, 166, 167
 Monica, 110, 126
 Monmouth, Duke of, 489
 Monod, Adolf, 543
 Monod, Frédéric, 543
 Monophysites, the, 134
 Monothelite controversy, 134
 Montaigne, Michel de, 438
 Montalembert, 535, 542
 Montanism, 59, 85
 Montanus, 59
 Monte Casino, monastery at, 115
 Montfort, Simon de, 194
 Montgomery, J., 664
 Montmorenci, the Constable, 335, 336
 Montreal, founded, 457
 Moralities, the, 239
 Morals, in the Augustan age, 12, 13; among the early Christians, 59, 60, 61; in Period III., 110; in the Middle Ages, 227. For theory of, see Ethics
 Moravia, Catholic reaction in, 393
 Moravians, the, conversion of, 164
 Moravians, the, at Herrnhut, 505, 506; their organization, 507; their relation to Wesley, 516, 517, 518; in America, 579; their missionary activity, 585, 590 *seq.*; influence of, 620
 More, Hannah, 523
 More, Henry, 480, 599, 603
 More, Thomas, 282, 283, 284, 303, 352, 353, 354
 Morgan, Thomas, 606
 Mormons, the, 581, 582
 Morone, 385, 390
 Morrison, Robert, 591
 Mortal sins, 141, 225, 226; the Reformers on, 445
 Mosheim, 621
 Mühlendorf, battles of, 246, 316
 Mühlenberg, Henry Melchior, 574
 Mühlenberg, William A., 569
 Müller, Julius, 627, 637, 638, 640
 Münster, disturbances at, 314
 Munzer, Thomas, 301, 425
 Murray, Earl of, 365, 367, 396
 Murray, John, 617
 Murton, 426
 Music, church, 65, 121
 Mutianus, 282
 Mystery plays, the, 239
 Mystics, the, 277, 495, 649
 NAASSENI, 76
 Nantes, Edict of, 340, 494
 Naples, 195, 251, 267, 385, 502, 503
 Napoleon I., 529 *seq.*, 543. III., 538, 540, 541, 543
 Nationalism, rise of the spirit of, 240
 Navarre, 253
 Nazareans, 74
 Neander, 627, 640
 Necromancy, 479
 Nectarius, 102
 Negroes, the American, 595
 Nehemiah, 14
 Nero, 31, 32
 Nerva, 46
 Nestorian controversy, the, 129, 133
 Nestorians, the, rise of, 133; their missionaries, 166; Protestant attempts to reform, 593
 Nestorius, 133
 Netherlands, the Reformation in, 341 *seq.*; becomes Calvinistic, 341; attempts of Charles V. to repress, *ib.*, 342; of Philip II., 342 *seq.*; outburst of iconoclasm, 344; Alva's cruelties, *ib.*; Calvinists in, assisted by Elizabeth, 363; Anabaptists in, 425; missionary activity in, 588

- Nevin, 575, 576
 New England, two classes of Puritan settlers in, 459; early education in, 467; witchcraft delusion in, 479 *seq.*; state of religion in, in the eighteenth century, 524
 New England theology, the, 611 *seq.*
 New Haven Colony, the, political system of, 465, 524; united with the Connecticut Colony, 466
 New Hebrides, 597
 "New Jerusalem Church," the, 509
 "New lights," the, 526, 527, 612
 New Platonism, 12, 218
 New School Presbyterians, 562, 571, 572, 588, 614
 New Testament, the, origin of, 43, 44, 79
 New York, severity of courts in, 469; the Episcopal Church established in, 477; the Reformed Church in, *ib.*
 Newell, Samuel, 588, 590
 Newman, J. H., 113, 135, 236, 550, 630, 664
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 432, 498
 Newton, John, 522, 632, 664
 Newton Seminary, 564
 Nicea, Council of, 104, 119, 130; second Council of, 135
 Nicene Creed formed, 130; reaffirmed, 131; the text of, 132
 Nicholas I., Pope, his career, 170, 177, 180; and the Bulgarians, 164, 228; on use of torture, 233. II., 173, 174. V., restores papal authority and splendor, 263, 279; bewails the capture of Constantinople, 264
 Nicholas I., of Russia, 557
 Nicholas von Hontheim, 504
 Niclas, Henry, 427
 Niebuhr, 647, 648
 Nightingale, Florence, 659
 Nihilism, in Russia, 557
 Nikon, 557
 Nitschmann, 506
 Nitzsch, 627
 Noachian precepts, the, 16
 Nobili, Robert, 455
 Nobunaga, 455
 Nogaret, William, 242, 243
 Nominalism, 210, 211, 218, 271, 280
 Nonna, 110
 Norbert, Father, 500, 501
 Nördlingen, Battle of, 410
 Normans, the, conversion of, 163, 164
 Norris, John, 599
 Northumberland, the Duke of, 357, 359
 Northumbria becomes Christian, 148
 Norton, Andrews, 616, 617
 Nott, Samuel, 587, 590
 Novatians, 58, 109
 Nowell, Alexander, 376
 Nuns, the, precursors of, 62
 Nuremberg, Diets at, 300
 Nuremberg, Peace of, 306
 Occam, William of, 206, 216, 218, 247, 280, 351, 440; his career, 271, 272
 Occamists, the, 272
 Occasional Conformity Bill, the, 510
 Ochino, Bernardino, 358, 385, 389
 Odoacer, 97
 Oecolampadius, 359, 427
 Olaf (Lapking), 163
 "Old Calvinists," the, 562
 "Old Catholics," the, 538, 539
 "Old School" Presbyterians, the, 571, 572, 588, 614
 Olin, Stephen, 578
 Olivétan, Peter, 319
 Olmedo, Bartholomé de, 456
 Oncken, 547
 Onesimus, 39
 Ontological argument, the, 219, 220
 Oosterzee, 546
 Ophites, 76
 Oratory of Divine Love, the, 384
 Ordeals, 161, 233
 Ordination, 226
 Organ, the, 420, 421
 Origen, 45, 49, 67, 72, 81, 82, 83, 85, 86
 Ormuzd, 98
 Orosius, 139
 Osiander, 353, 424
 Osiandrian controversy, the, 424
 Ostara, 145
 Oswald, 148
 Oswin, 148
 Otfried, 176
 Otho I., Emp. H. R. E., 171, 172, 228. III., 172. IV., 192, 193
 Otranto, 266
 Otterbein, Philip, 579
 Otto, Bishop of Bamberg, 165
 Ovando, 450
 Owen, John, 434, 601
 Oxenstiern, 478
 Oxford, origin of, 210; religious tone of, in the eighteenth century, 513; the Tractarian movement at, 550, 630
 PACCA, 533
 Pachomius, 113
 Paganism, revival of under Julian, 90, 91; decay of, 98
 Palatinate, the, 409
 Palatine, the Elector, 399, 409
 Paleario, martyrdom of, 390
 Paleologus, John, 262
 Palestine, the Christians driven from, 201
 Paley, William, 608, 610
 Palfrey, J. G., 475
 Paine, Thomas, 607
 Palladius, legend of, 96
 Pallavicini, 436
 Palmer, Ray, 664
 Palmerston, 545
 Palm Sunday, 119
 Pantænus, 72
 Pantheism, 218, 327; of Bruno, 437; of Spinoza, *ib.*, 438; more recent, 625
 Papacy, the (see Rome, See of), origin of, 105; based on the primacy of Peter, 106; growth favored by political cir-

- ousstances, 107; subservient to Justinian, 108; early power of in England, 149; relation to the Eastern emperors, 157, 158, 159; relation to the Eastern Church, 158; relation to the Franks, 158, 159; relation to the restored Roman empire, 159, 160, 168; influence of in secular affairs, 168; claims of advanced by the pseudo-Isidorian decretals, 169; by the donation of Constantine, 170; during the pornocracy, 171; relation to the Holy Roman Empire, *ib.*; relation to Henry III., 172; alliance with Robert Guiscard, 174; quarrel with the Eastern Church, 177; Gregory VII.'s theory of, 182; struggle with the Empire about the right of investiture, 184 *seq.*; effect of the crusades upon, 186, 192; contest with Fred. I., 189, 190, 191; Innocent III.'s theory of, 192; contest with Fred. II., 196 *seq.*; protected by the Lombard cities, 197; extortion of, 196, 199, 202, 249; effect of the fall of the Hohenstaufens upon, 200; loss of power, *ib.*; affected by the rise of nationalism, 240; decline of, *ib.*, 245; enslaved to France, 245; Occam on, 247; Marsilius on, *ib.*; weakened by the contest with Louis of Bavaria, 248; resisted in England, 249; the great schism in, 250 *seq.*; Wyclif on, 252; Gerson on, 254, 255; attempts to reform, 254 *seq.*; restored by Martin V., 259; revival of under Nicholas V., 263; under Pius II., 264, 265; growing weakness of, 265; moral fall of, 265 *seq.*; Erasmus on, 283, 285; Thomas More on, 284; at the beginning of the Reformation, 287; Luther on, 294; political policy of, favors the Reformation, 296, 304, 316, 391; relations of with Henry VIII., 347 *seq.*; with Elizabeth, 362; tone of, revived, 386; restoration of, through the influence of the Jesuits and of the Council of Trent, 388; how regarded in Puritan England, 404; loss of political power consequent upon the Reformation, 411; Bellarmine on, 435, 436; the Reformers on, 445; conflict of with Louis XIV., 494; condemns the Jesuits, 500, 502, 503; conflict with Joseph II., 504, 505; restored under Pius VII., 532; espouses absolutism, *ib.*, 533. See, also, under the several popes
- Papias, 70
 Paraclete, the, 59, 78
 Paraguay, the Spanish in, 457; the Catholic missionaries in, *ib.*, 501
 Paravas, the, Xavier among, 453
 Paradise. See Heaven
 Paris, University of, the, origin of, 209, 210; attempts to heal the great schism, 252, 253, 254; its conservatism, 280; opposes the Reformation, 319, 330
 Park, Edwards A., 614
 Parker, Matthew, 375, 376, 377
 Parker, Theodore, 617
 Parliament, the English, subservient to Henry VIII., 350
 Parma, the Jesuits expelled from, 502
 Parseeism, 98, 589
 Parsons, Levi, 592
 Pascal, 436, 496, 500
 Paschal II., 186, 187
 Paschasius Radbertus, 179
 Passau, Treaty of, 408, 417
 Passover, the, kept by Christians, 40
 Pastoral epistles, the, 29
 Patriarch, the term, 57, 105
 Patriarchates, the, rise of, 104, 105
 Patrick, St., 96
 Patrick, Bp., 599
 Patrimony of St. Peter. See States of the Church
 Patripassianism, 81
 Patronage, 156, 554, 555
 Pattenon, John Coleridge, 597
 Paul, his conversion, 21; missionary journeys, 22, 27; on the freedom and universality of the gospel, 23; his relation to the "pillar" apostles, *ib.*; his relation to the decree of the apostolic council, 24; at Antioch, 25; characteristics of his preaching, 26; legends respecting, 33, 88; type of his teaching, 42; at Jerusalem, 28; at Rome, 29; his death, *ib.*
 Paul II., 265. III., his accession, 385; his religious policy, 386; deposes Henry VIII., 350; sanctions the Jesuit order, 387; calls the council of Trent, 388; quarrels with Charles V., 316, 317; transfers the council of Trent to Bologna, 317. IV. (see Caraffa), his demands on England, 361; degrades Pole, 362; his attitude towards Elizabeth, 362; introduces the Index, 390; his hatred of the Spaniards, 391; puts an end to nepotism, 392; his death, 390, 392. V., 411, 412, 436
 Paulicians, the, 162
 Paulinus, 147, 148
 Paulus, 623
 Pavia, battle of, 298; council of, 260
 Pearson, John, 432, 448
 Peasants, the German, condition of, 296; revolt of, 301, 415, 425
 Pede-baptists, the, 552
 Pelagian controversy, the, 129, 135
 Pelagius, his career, 135 *seq.*
 Penance, origin of, 58; systematized, 109; among the Germans, 160; the schoolmen on, 225; mediæval system of, 231
 Penn, William, 478, 479, 491
 Pennsylvania, settled, 478
 Penry, John, 461
 Pentateuch, discussions on, 550, 622
 Pentecost, the day of, 19
 Pentecost, feast of, 65, 119
 Pepin, 151, 155, 157 *seq.*
 Pepys, 488
 Peratæ, 76
 Perfection, Christian, Wesley on, 519
 Perpetua, an early martyr, 48
 Persecution of the Christians, its rise and

- its causes, 30, 31; by Nero, 31; by Domitian, 33; under Trajan and later emperors, 46 *seq.*; by the Persians, 98
- Persecution of heathen, under Constantius, 89; under Theodosius, 93; under Honorius, 94; under Justinian, 98
- Persecution of heretics, of Arians by Theodosius, 93; of the Paulicians, 162; of the Albigenses, 194; of the Fratricelli, 207; of the Hussites, 260, 275; of the Lollards, 274
- Persecution by heretics, of Athanasius and his followers by Constantius, 90
- Persecution of the Jews, 91, 167, 168
- Persecution of Protestants, at Meaux, 331; in Paris, 333, 334; the Waldensian, 335; at Vassy, 337; St. Bartholemew, 339; in the Netherlands, 341 *seq.*; in England, 353, 360, 361; in Scotland, 364; in Italy, 389, 390; in Spain, 390, 391; of the Huguenots, 493, 494
- Persecution by Protestants, theory, 326, 345, 415, 418, 447; of Roman Catholics in England, 353, 369, 370, 398, 401; of dissenters, 381, 403, 425, 489, 510; at Geneva, 327; in New England, 469 *seq.*; in Virginia, 469, 476; in New York, 477; of the Quakers, 492
- Perseverance of the saints, Augustine on, 136, 445; Calvin on, 321; the Lutherans on, 445; the Arminians and Socinians on, *ib.*
- Persia, spread of Christianity to, 98; Protestant missions in, 593
- Perthes, F., 646, 647
- Peshito version, the, 79
- Pessimism, 634
- Petavius, 436, 601
- Peter the apostle, 18; his early precedence, 18; his relation to the Gentiles, 20, 23; career of, 26; primacy of, 57, 106; Marsilius on, 247; Epistles of, 43
- Peter III. of Aragon, 200
- Peter the Great, 557
- Peter of Bruges, 424
- Peter of Castelnau, 194, 205
- Peter the Hermit, 186
- Peter Martyr. See Martyr
- Peter de Roya, remarks on the monks of Clairvaux, 204
- Peter of Murrone (Celestine V.), 200, 201
- Peter the Venerable, 213
- Peter de Vineia, 199
- Peters, Hugh, 405
- Peters, Samuel, 468
- Petit, 259
- Petition of Right, the, 401
- Petrarch, 249, 278
- Pfaff, 417
- Pfefferkorn, 282
- Pflug, 314
- Pharisees, the, 15; conspiracy against Jesus, 17; in the Jerusalem church, 22
- Philadelphia, founded, 478
- Philanthropy, recent, 655
- Philargi (Alexander V.), 255
- Philaster, Cardinal, 257
- Philemon, the Epistle to, 29, 43
- Philip the apostle, 18, 32
- Philip the Arabian, 49
- Philip I. of France, 184, 185. II. (Augustus), 191, 193. IV. (the Fair), 240 *seq.* VI., 248
- Philip the Hohenstaufen, 192, 193
- Philip II. of Spain, intrigues against the French Protestants, 334, 336, 338; his aims, 342; attempts to check the Reformation in the Netherlands, 343 *seq.*; sends Alva thither, 344; an adviser of "Bloody Queen" Mary, 359; marries her, 360; hated by Paul IV., 363; his treatment of Paul IV., 391. III., 345, 457
- Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, 297, 310, 315, 316, 317, 332, 394, 416
- Philippians, the Epistle to the, 29, 43
- Philo, 15
- Philosophy, ancient, characteristics of, 10 *seq.*; the "handmaid" of religion, 209; after the Reformation, 436, 437; modern, 602 *seq.*
- Photius, 177, 181
- Pico della Mirandola, 281
- Pictures, use of, in the churches, 64, 117
- Pietism, 620
- Pietists, the, 584
- Pilate, Pontius, 14, 17
- Pilgrim fathers, the, 459 *seq.*
- Pilgrimages, 118, 160, 175, 231, 242
- Pisa, council of, 255
- Pius II., 264, 265. IV., 362, 392. V., 370, 392. VI., 504, 529. VII., 530-534, 582. IX., 536, 537, 542, 544, 552, 559
- Placeus (Laplace), 428, 441
- Plasian, William de, 242
- Plato, 10, 11, 12; his influence on later philosophy, 15, 71, 122, 210
- Pliny, the younger, 46
- Plutarch, on the value of religion, 413
- Plütschau, 589
- Plymouth, founded, 405, 463
- Plymouth Brethren, the, 553
- Podiebrad, George, 265
- Poetry, spirit of modern, 641
- Poitiers, battle of, 154
- Poisseevin, 556
- Poissy, colloquy at, 336, 337
- Poland, the Reformation in, 313; Catholic reaction in, 393; Socinians in, 430; and the papacy, 556
- Pole, Reginald, in Italy, 385; made cardinal, 386; returns to England, 360; his death, 362, 390
- Polemics, the, 73
- Politiques, the, 339
- Polycarp, 69, 80; martyrdom of, 47, 48
- Pombal, 498, 501, 503
- Pomeranians, the, conversion of, 165
- Pompadour, Madame de, 502
- Pomponius Laetus, 281
- Ponticus, an early martyr, 48
- Pope, the term, 107, 108; the method of his election, 191, 200
- Pope, Alexander, 608
- Port Royalists, 436, 500
- Portugal, given part of the New World,

- 268; navigators of the, 450; in Japan, 456; the Jesuits expelled from, 501, 502; ecclesiastical reforms in, 503
- Positivism, 634
- Pothinus, an early martyr, 48, 73
- Præmunire, statute of, 249, 349
- Pragmatic Sanction, of Louis IX., 202; of Bourges, 262; abolished by Louis XI., 265; restored, *ib.*; abandoned, 270
- Prague, University of, 275, 499
- Prayer, forms of, 65, 96; for the dead, 68, 142, 143; one by Clement of Rome, 69; to saints and martyrs, 83
- Prayer-book of the English Church, framed, 358; supports conservatism, 376; in Ireland, 382; revision of, asked by the Puritans, 394; attempt to force it upon Scotland, 403; the use of forbidden in England, 406, 484; first attempt to use, at Salem, Mass., 470, revised in the U. S., 567, 568, 570
- Preaching, in Period III., 120; mediæval, 237, 238; modern, 651, 652
- Predestination, the Apostolic Fathers on, 80; Augustine on, 137; Pelagius on, *ib.*; Gottschalk on, 179; Scotus Erigena on, 180; Calvin on, 321; the English Reformers on, 372; the German Reformed Church on, 428; the Arminians on, 429; the Reformers on, 442; the Greeks and Roman Catholics on, *ib.*; the Jansenists on, *ib.* See, also, Grace
- Premonstrants, the, order of, 203
- Presbyter, the term, 36, 52 *seq.*; later, 103
- Presbyterian Board of Missions, 588, 592
- Presbyterianism, in France, 334; in Scotland, 367, 368, 396, 397, 403, 554; Cartwright, the promoter of, 377, 378, 380; the divine right of, 406; in different countries, 418, 466
- Presbyterians, the English, 404, 405, 427, 484, 485, 486, 552, 553; in the eighteenth century, 523; in United States, 570 *seq.*, 614; their missionaries, 587
- Price, Richard, 610
- Prideaux, Humphrey, 433
- "Pride's purge," 407
- Priesthood, rise of, in the early Church, Harnack on, 54; Lightfoot on, *ib.*; as representing the visible Church, 101; Marsilius on, 247; attacks on, 272; Thomas More on, 234
- Priestley, Joseph, 615
- Prignano, Francesco, 251
- Princeton College, origin of, 526
- Printing, art of, invented, 279
- Priscilla, 41
- Prison reform, 656, 657, 658
- Probation after death, 641
- Propaganda, the, 582, 583; College of the, 582
- Propagation Society, the, 566
- Property, right of, the schoolmen on, 234
- Proselytes, Jewish, 16
- Protest, the, of the Lutherans, 304
- Protestantism, anticipated, 273, 274; the way prepared for, 277, 278; causes of the check of, 393, 394; variations of its polity, 413 *seq.*; its worship, 419 *seq.*; its peculiar genius, 421; Dörner on its effect, 424. See, also, Reformation
- Protestants, the origin of the term, 304; divisions among, in Poland, 313; in Hungary, 314; in Germany, 315; on the continent, 407, 408; doctrinal teaching of, 423 *seq.*; their view of faith, 444; view of merit, 445; of the Church, *ib.*; of the clergy, *ib.*; rejects celibacy, 446; view of the sacraments, *ib.*; the early, their attitude toward missions, 451; rise of their missionary activity, 584 *seq.*
- Protestant creeds, growth of their authority, 440
- Protestant Methodist Church, 578
- Providence, Divine, the Apostolic Fathers on, 80; Aquinas on, 220; Albert the Great on, *ib.*
- Providence, city of, founded, 471
- "Provisors," statute of, 249
- Provoost, Samuel, 568
- Prussia, the, conversion of, 165, 166; the Reformation in, 313; the Jesuits expelled from, 503
- Psellus, Michael, 181
- Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, 74
- Pseudo-Dionysius, 180
- Pseudo-Isidorian decretals, 169
- Ptolemies, the, 14
- Puffendorf, 417
- Purgatory, introduction of the doctrine of, 142; in Period IV., 161; the schoolmen on, 226; rejected by the Reformers, 448; the Greek view of, 449
- Puritans in England, the rise of, 375 *seq.*, 380; their aims, 394; who they were, 395; when they became formal, *ib.*; persecuted by Charles I., 400, 401; and Laud, 402, 403; their aims under Charles I., 404; their ideas on worship, 419; on the Lord's Day, 448; two classes of, in New England, 459; their worship, 467; their laws, 468; organization of their ecclesiastical societies, 476; settle Massachusetts, 464; organization of their churches, 464, 465; their political system, 465; their aims, 466; their alleged intolerance, 469 *seq.*; in Maryland, 478
- Puritan controversy, origin of, 371, 375
- Pusey, E. B., 550, 630, 631
- Puseyites, the, 630, 631
- Pythagoras, 10
- QUAKERS, the, rise of, 490, 491; their tenets, 491, 492; early treatment of, 492; in Virginia, 469, 474; in the Massachusetts colony, 474, 475; at New Amsterdam, 474, 477; in Rhode Island, 476; in England, 551; tolerated in Connecticut, 559; later history of, 579, 580, 660
- Quarto-deciman controversy, the, 65
- Quebec founded, 457

Quenstedt, 424
Quietism, 495

RABANUS MAURUS, 179

Rabelais, François, 438

Racovian Confession, the, 430

Radagaisus, 94

Radbodus, Paschasius, 179

Raikes, Robert, 656

Ranny, Dr. Robert, 636

Ranke, 411

Rankin, Thomas, 576

Raoul, 205

Raphael, 269, 288

Raskolniks, the, 557

Rationalism, in France, 543; in Holland,

546; in Germany, 620 *seq.*

Ratherius, of Verona, 176, 179

Ratisbon, Catholic alliance at, 300; con-

ference at, 314, 386; failure of, 315

Ratramnus, 179

Rauch, F. A., 575

Realism, 210, 212

Reason, Augustine on, 140; Duns Scotus

on, 219; Aquinas on, *ib.*; the Reform-

ers on, 440; the Latitudinarians on, 598

Recared, K. of Spain, 157

"Recognitions," the, 74

Redemption, Westminster creeds on ext-

ent of, 406. See, also, Atonement,

Predestination

Reform, early attempts at, 255

Reformation, the, long in preparation,

287; discussion on the significance of,

288; a religious movement, 289; causes

of, *ib.*; relation to the right of private

judgment, *ib.*; two aspects of, 290;

begins in Germany, *ib.*; aided by the

quarrels of its enemies, 296, 298, 304,

316, 391; tolerated by the council of

the regency, 300; injured by the

Knights' war, *ib.*; the Peasants' revolt,

301; by the sacramentarian contro-

versy, 309; allies itself with democracy

at Lübeck, 311; injured by the terms

of the Peace of Augsburg, 318; check

of, 393, 394

Reformed Church, the, in America, 573,

574, 588, 592

Reformed Church in the U. S. (German

Reformed Church), 575, 576

Reformed Episcopal Church, the, 570

"Reformed Presbyterians," the, 573

Reformers, the early, 271 *seq.*

Reforming councils, the, 254 *seq.*

Regency, Council of, policy toward the

Reformation, 300

Regeneration, the Arminians on, 429. See,

also, Grace, Predestination

Reid, Thomas, 609

Reimarus, 621

Reinhard, 623

Reinkens, 539

Relics, 118, 230

Relief Church of Scotland, 550

Religious plays, the, 239

Religious Tract Society, 587

Remigius, 96

Renaissance, the, 278 *seq.*; influence of,
on religion, 279; in Italy, 280, 384; in
Germany, 281, 282; in England, 282,
283, 395; attended by skepticism, 288

Renan, 544

René, Duchess of Ferrara, 323, 385

Requesens, 345

Reservations, papal, 249, 262

Restitution, Edict of, 409, 410

Restorationism, 86, 143, 618, 624, 640

Resurrection of Christ, the, 18

Resurrection, the, the Apostolic Fathers

on, 85; the Greek theologians on, 143;

Augustine on, *ib.*; Swedenborg on, 509;

recent views on, 639

Reuchlin, John, 281, 282, 293

Reuss, 622

Revelation, book of, 32. See, also, Apoc-

alypse

Revelation, Locke on, 604. See, also,

God

Réville, Albert, 544

Revival of learning, the, 278 *seq.* See,

also, Renaissance

Reynolds, John, 397

Rhenish Missionary Society, the, 588

Rhode Island, founded, 476; early relig-

ious policy of, 479

Riario, Girolamo, 365

Ricci, Lorenzo, 502

Ricci, Matthew, in China, 455

Rice, Luther, 583

Richard I. of England, 191

Richard of St. Victor, 214

Richelieu, 410, 412, 493

Ridgeley, T., 611

Ridley, 360, 431

Rienzi, 249

Ritschl, A., 628

Ritual, the Thirty-nine Articles on, 419;

controversy on in England, 375 *seq.*, 550,

631

Rizzio, 367

"Robber Synod," the, 134

Robert, K. of France, 238

Robertson, F. W., 632

Robertson, William, 554

Robespierre, 529, 607

Robinson, Edward, 572

Robinson, John, 405, 462, 463, 464, 470

Rochelle, capture of, 401, 493

Rogers, John, 354, 360

Romaine, William, 523, 632

Roman Academy, the, 281

Roman Cathecism, the, 435

Roman Catholics, persecuted in England

for political reasons, 370; attitude of

Charles I. towards, 400, 401; on pre-

destination and grace, 442; on justifica-

tion, 444; their early missionary zeal,

451 *seq.*; in Maryland, 478; favored by

Charles II., 487; by James II., 489;

in the U. S., 580, 581; their later mis-

sionary activity, 582, 583

Roman Catholic Church, the, power of,

promoted by the Jesuits, 388; consoli-

dated by the council of Trent, 389

Roman Empire, extent in first century

- A.D., 8; fostered a cosmopolitan feeling, *ib.*; travel and intercourse in, 9; becomes the patron of the Church, 87; of the West comes to an end, 97; revived under Charlemagne, theory of, 159; the Holy, see Holy Roman Empire
- Roman law, revival of, 189, 209, 210; in France, 242
- Roman religion, decay of, 89 *seq.*; death-blow to, 94
- Roman republics, the mediæval, 188, 189, 249, 250
- Romanesque architecture, 235
- Romans, their legacy to mankind, 13; the Epistle to the, 28
- Rome, early schools at, 209; mediæval factions in, 249; adorned by Nicholas V., 263; sacked by Charles V., 304; taken from the pope, 537
- Rome, church of, founded, 29; primacy of, 57 *seq.*; Irenæus and Clement on, 53
- Rome, see of, its services to the city, 95; exaltation of, 105; an Apostolic Church, *ib.*; growth of its power in the West, 105 *seq.*; effect of Eastern doctrinal controversies upon, 106; favored by the political situation, 107; controlled by Justinian, 108; influence in general councils, 129; Augustine on, 142; advanced by Boniface, 150, 151. See, also, Papacy and under the several popes
- Romilly, Sir Samuel, 659
- Roncalian fields, parliament at, 189
- Roscellin, his career, 212
- Rossi, 536
- Rothad, 170
- Rothe, 419, 627, 636, 639, 640, 646
- Rousseau, 126, 465, 619
- Roussel, Gérard, 331, 332
- Royer-Collard, 634
- Rudolph I. of Hapsburg, 199. II., 408
- Rudolph of Suabia, 185
- Rufinus, 67, 125, 139
- Russian Church, the, 165, 177, 413, 556
- Rutgers College, 574
- SABBATH (Saturday), still observed, 118; "the great," 119
- Sabellianism, 81
- Sacerdotalism, rise of, in the early Church, 54, 101
- Sacheverell, 510
- Sacraments, the, origin of the term, 84; efficacy of, 142; discarded by the Paulicians, 162; the seven, 223; Aquinas on, 224; the Reformers on, 446, 447; the Arminians on, 446; discarded by the Quakers, 492
- "Sacred Heart," the, worship of, 534, 542
- Sadducees, the, 15
- Sadolet, 325, 384, 386, 390
- Saints, the, worship of, 117, 118, 160, 175; canonization of, 176; invocation of, 226, 229, 230; legends of, 229
- Salem, founded, 464; witchcraft in, 480
- Sales, Francis of, 436
- Salvian, his career, 128
- Samaritans, the, 14
- Sanctis, Luigi de, 545
- Sandemanians, 645
- Sandwich Islands, Protestant missions in, 596, 597
- Sandys, Edwin, 376
- Sanhedrim, the, 15
- Saracens, the. See Mohammedanism
- Sardica, council of, 103, 104, 105, 131
- Sarpi, Paul, 269, 435
- Satan, 67, 77, 81, 83, 86, 115, 141, 162, 221, 229, 365, 400, 431, 443, 454, 479, 480, 482
- Satisfaction. See Merit
- Saturninus, 76
- Saumur, school of, 428
- Savonarola, his political relations, 267; his career, 276; his work for Florence, 277; his death, 277; his "Triumph of the Cross," 280
- Savoy Declaration, the, 407; conference, the, 486; confession, the, 427
- Saxons, 95, 151
- Saybrook Platform, 466
- Schaff, Philip, 120, 575, 576
- Schauffler, W. G., 593
- Schelling, 625
- Scherer, 543
- Schiller, 642
- Schism, the, of Felicissimus, Navatian, and Meletius, 58; the Great, beginning of, 250; efforts to end, 252; close of, 254; effects of, 256
- Schism Bill, the, 511
- Schleiermacher, 617, 624, 627, 640
- Schlichtingius, 431
- Scholasticism, definition of, 208; beginning of, 209; maxim of, *ib.*; and the universities, *ib.*; method of, 211; divisions of the era of, *ib.*; second period of, 215; decadence of, 218; fall of, 271, 280
- Scholten, 546
- Schomburg, 494
- Schoolmen, the, characteristics of, 209; ablest, Dominicans or Franciscans, 210; defective historical insight of, 219; as mystics, 277
- Schopenhauer, 634
- Schwartz, C. F., 589, 590
- Schwenckfeld, Caspar, 426, 427
- Science and religion, 645
- Scientia Media*, 442
- Scotists, the, 216, 220
- Scotland, character of, in the sixteenth century, 363; rise of the Reformation in, *ib.*; Calvinistic Protestantism established in, 365, 367; the Church of, its constitution, 367, 368, 396, 397; its formularies, 367, 368; the Solemn League and Covenant adopted in, 404; Presbyterian polity in, 418; Episcopacy imposed upon, 487, 554; religious denominations in, 554 *seq.*
- Scott, Thomas, 522, 619, 632
- Scottish confession, the, 427; on baptism, 447
- Scottish Missionary Society, 587

- Scotus, John Duns, a Franciscan, 206 ;
 his career, 216 ; inclined to Semi-Pela-
 gianism, 217 ; on reason, 219 ; on the
 will, 220 ; on man, *ib.* ; on the fall, *ib.* ;
 on grace, 222 ; on the atonement, *ib.*
 Scotus, John, Erigena, his career, 180
 Scribes, the, 15
 Scriptures, the Sacred, doctrine of, in the
 early Church, 78, 79 ; later, 139 ; the
 Protestants on, 423, 437, 438, 439, 440 ;
 Schwenckfeld on, 426 ; Quakers on, 491 ;
 Chillingworth on, 600 ; recent views on,
 635, 636. See, also, Bible
 Scrooby, the independents at, 461, 462
 Seabury, Samuel, 567, 568
 Sears, Barnas, 547, 564
 Secker, Abp., 566
 Selden, 417, 434
 Selwyn, Bp., 597
 Semi-Arians, 131
 Semi-Pelagianism, 128, 138
 Semler, 621
 Seneca, 12
 Separatists, the, 460 *seq.*
 Septimius Severus, 48
 Septuagint, the, 14
 Serampore Mission, the, 590
 Serapis, worshippers of, 111 ; the temple
 of, destroyed, 94
 Serfdom, relation of the mediæval Church
 to, 232, 233
 Sergius I., 158
 Sernon, the, in the early Church, 65, 120
 Servetus, 326, 327, 430
 Service, the Church, order of, 120. See
 also, Worship
 Severin, 149
 Sforza, Francesco, 298
 Shaftesbury, 606
 Sharp, Granville, 660
 Sharp, James, 487, 489
 Shelley, 641, 642
 "Shepherd," the, of Hermas, 69, 79
 Sherlock, William, 432, 601, 605
 Shintoism, 592
 Sibour, 542
 "Sibylline Oracles," 73
 Sicilian Vespers, the, 200
 Sicilies, the, a fief of the Roman see, 189,
 193
 Sickingen, Francis von, 300
 Sidney, Sir Philip, 423
 Sigismund, Emp. H. R. E., 256, 258, 259,
 260, 275
 Sigismund III. of Poland, 556
 Simeon the Stylite, 112
 Simeon, Charles, 651, 652
 Simeon, the canticle of, 334, 335
 Simon Zelotes, 33
 Simony, 157, 153
 Sin, the Apostolic Fathers on, 82 ; Pela-
 gius on, 136 ; Augustine on, *ib.* ; Cas-
 sian on, 138 ; the schoolmen on, 220 ;
 Flacius on, 424 ; Laplace on, 428 ; the
 Socinians on, 431, 441 ; the Reformers
 on, 441 ; Quakers on, 492 ; Locke on,
 604 ; Coleridge on, 609 ; federal the-
 ory, 610, 611 ; Edwards on, 612 ; Hop-
 kins on, 613 ; Taylor on, 614 ; Leibnitz
 on, 620 ; recent views on, 637
 Siricius, 116
 Sistine Chapel, the, decorated, 269
 Six Articles, the, 355, 357
 Sixtus I., martyrdom of, 49 ; IV., 265,
 266, 292 ; V., 392, 411
 Skepticism, diffusion of, in the Roman
 empire, 10 ; causes of, 279, 280 ; in re-
 lation to the Reformation, 288 ; recent,
 645
 Slaves, attempts to convert the, 164
 Slavery, relation of the Church to, 39,
 232, 233 ; negro, introduced into Amer-
 ica, 451 ; abolished, 660, 661
 Smalcald, League of, its formation, 306 ;
 aided by the Bohemians, 313 ; extended,
 314, 354 ; weakened by dissension, 315 ;
 defeated, 316
 "Smalcald Articles," the, 424
 Smalcaldic war, the, 316, 356, 388
 Smith, Adam, 610
 Smith, Eli, 592
 Smith, Henry B., 614
 Smith, John, 599
 Smith, John Pye, 553
 Smith, Joseph, 581, 582
 Smyth, John, 426
 Socialism, 540 ; in Russia, 557 ; causes of,
 644
 Society for the Propagation of the Faith,
 583
 Society for the Propagation of the Gos-
 pel, 586, 590, 591, 595
 Socinianism, rise of, 430, 431 ; in Eng-
 land, 512. See, also, Unitarianism
 Socinians, the, views on doctrine, 439-445
 Socinus, Faustus, 430, 431 ; attacks the
 Anselmic view of the atonement, 443
 Socinus, Lælius, 430
 Socrates, 10, 414
 Socrates, a continuator of Eusebius, 128
 Solemn League and Covenant, the, 403,
 404, 487, 554
 Solomon, the Wisdom of, 15
 Solway Moss, battle of, 363
 Somerset, 357
 Sorbonne, College of, opposes the Refor-
 mation, 330 *seq.* ; censures Des Cartes,
 437 ; condemns the propositions of Féne-
 lon, 496
 Soul, the doctrine respecting the, of the
 Apostolic Fathers, 82 ; Des Cartes on
 the, 437. See, also, Man
 South, Robert, 432, 601
 South America, 583
 South Sea Islands, the, 583, 595, 596, 597
 Sozomen, 128
 Spain, conquered by the Saracens, 154,
 157 ; Church in 155 ; under the Moslem
 rule, 166 ; during the Great Schism,
 255 ; a consolidated monarchy in, 266 ;
 given part of the New World, 268 ; in-
 fluence of, in Italy, 269 ; Protestantism
 in, 390 ; suppression of, 391 ; the Catho-
 lic reaction in, *ib.* ; the navigators of,
 449, 450 ; the explorers of, in North
 America, 459 ; the Jesuits expelled

- from, 502; Napoleonic reforms in, 531; recalls the Jesuits, 534
 Spalding, Solomon, 581
 Spangenberg, 516
 Spencer, Herbert, 633, 634
 Spener, 506, 534
 Spinola, 497
 Spinoza, 437, 438, 617, 622
 Spires, Diet of, 304
 Spiritual Franciscans, the, 272
 Stage, the, condemned by the Puritans and others, 514
 Standish, Miles, 463
 Stanley, A. P., 632
 Star Chamber, the, 403
 State, the theory of, Marsilius on, 247
 States of the Church, the, origin and history of, 159, 192, 250, 251, 259, 263, 265 *seq.*, 529, 536, 537
 Staupitz, John, 291
 St. Bartholomew, massacre of, 338, 339
 Steele, Anne, 664
 Stephen, the martyr, 20
 Stephen III., pope, 159; IX., 173
 Stephen, St., K. of Hungary, 165
 Stephen, Abbot of Citeaux, 203
 Stevens, 577
 St. Germain, edict of, 337; peace of, 338
 Stiles, Ezra, 527
 Stilicho, 94
 Stillingfleet, Edward, 432, 601
 St. Maur, Benedictine Congregation of, 412
 St. Peter's Church, its foundation laid, 269
 Stockholm, massacre of, 311
 Stoicism, 11, 12
 Story, 561
 Strada, 341
 Strauss, 548, 625
 Strawbridge, 576, 577
 Stuart, Moses, 562, 616
 Stubbs, Bp., 351
 Sturm, 151
 Stuyvesant, 477
 St. Victor, the school of, 214
 Suarez, Francis, 436
 Subdeacons, 55
 Subscription, theory of, 512, 600
 Suevi, the, 94
 Summerfield, John, 578
 Sunday, see Lord's Day
 Sunday-schools, rise of, 656
 Supererogation, works of, 83, 223; the Reformers on, 445
 Supremacy, Act of, 350, 351
 Sutri, Synod of, 172
 Sweden, the conversion of, 163, 164; tyranny of Christian II. in, 311; the Reformation in, 312; becomes a strong state, 411; later religious history of, 547
 Swedenborg, Emanuel, 507, 508, 509
 Swift, Dean, 511
 Switzerland, influenced by Luther, 290; the Reformation in, 306 *seq.*; owed much to Luther, 309; catastrophe of, 310; independence of, acknowledged, 411; later religious history of, 548
 Sykes, A. A., 601
 Syllabus of errors, 537
 Sylvester I., 170
 Symmachus, 108
 Synagogues, the, 15, 16
 Synods, rise of, 57; provincial, power of, 104. See, also, Councils
 Syria, tribes of, spread of Christianity to, 98; recent history of, 558; Protestant missions in, 592
 Syrian Evangelical Church, the, 592
 TABORITES, the, 260, 261
 Tacitus, 31
 Tahiti, 596
 Talismans, 229, 479
 Talleyrand, 523
 Taunism, 591
 Tartars, the, 166
 Tatian, 71
 Tauler, John, 277, 278, 291
 Taylor, Jeremy, 380, 431, 442, 515, 600
 Taylor, John, Mormon, 582
 Taylor, John, 611
 Taylor, N. W., 562, 613, 614
 "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," 41, 53, 65, 70, 84
 Temperance Reform, 661
 Templars, the, order of, 196, 207, 208, 245
 Ten Articles, the, 354
 Tennent, Gilbert, 526
 Tennent, William, 526
 "Territorial system," in Germany, 417
 Tertiaries, the, 206, 207
 Tertullian, 46, 59, 67, 73, 80, 82, 84, 85
 Test Act, the, 488, 510, 551
 Tetzl, John, 291
 Teutons, inroads of, 92 *seq.*, 94, 95, 97
 Thacker, 460
 Thaddeus of Suessa, 198, 199
 Thanksgiving Day, the New England, established, 468
 Theatins, the, 386
 Theodore, Roman Emp., 162
 Theodore of Mopsuestia, 124, 137, 139, 143
 Theodore of Tarsus, 149
 Theodoret, his career, 124; a continuator of Eusebius, 128
 Theodoric, 97
 Theodorus, the historian, 128
 Theodosius I., 93, 101, 102, 131; II., 133
 Theobald, 215
 Theognis, of Nicea, 130
 Theological schools, 66, 72, 122
 Theophilanthropists, the, 529
 Theophilus of Antioch, 71
 Theophilus, of Din, 45
 Theophilus, Bp. of Alexandria, 124
 Thessalonians, the Epistles to, 27
 Thiene, 386
 Thiers, 541
 Thirlwall, 632
 Thirty-nine Articles, their origin, 358, 369
 Thirty Years' War, 408, 409, 410
 Tholuck, 627, 652
 Thomas, the Apostle, 18, 33

- Thomas à Becket, 190, 191, 351
 Thomas, of Celano, 238
 Thomas à Kempis, 278
 Thomasius, 417
 Thomists, the, 216, 220
 "Three Chapters," the, 134
 Tillotson, John, 599
 Tilly, 409
 Timothy, 24, 27, 36; Epistles to, 43
 Tindal, Matthew, 605
 Tiridates, 98
 Titus, 23, 36
 Toland, John, 604
 Toledo, Council of, 131
 Toleration, Act of, 490, 510, 518
 Toleration, Constantine on, 88; Erasmus on, 285; John Robinson on, 462; Roger Williams on, 471
 Tolstoi, 557
 Toplady, Augustus, 610
 Torquemada, 389
 Torgau, League of, 304
 Torture, use of, 233
 Tractarian movement, the, 550, 620
 Tradition, doctrine of, 43, 79; in Period III., 139; Vincent of Lerins on, 140; Trent on, 388; the Protestants on, 423, 438
 Traducianism, 82
 Trajan, 46, 47, 92
 Transubstantiation, doctrine of, advanced by Paschasius Radbertus, 179; defended by Lanfranc, 225; sanctioned by Innocent III., *ib.*; attacked by Wyclif, 273; rejected by the Reformers, 447; adopted by the Greeks, *ib.*
 Transcendentalism, in New England, 617
 Trench, 228, 238, 664
 Trendelenburg, 634
 Trent, Council of, opened, 388; its work, *ib.*, 389; it consolidates the Roman Church, *ib.*; Protestants decline to enter, 315; transferred to Bologna, 317; reassembled at Trent, *ib.*; its theological work, 435; authorizes the Vulgate, 438
 Trinitarian controversy, the, in England, 601; in New England, 615, 616
 Trinity, the, 129; growth of the doctrine in the West, 132; above reason, 219; the schoolmen on, 221; Calvin on, 440, 441; other Reformers on, 441; Swedenborg on, 508; Watts on, 611
 "Truce of God," the, 175
 Trullan Council, the second, 158
 Trypho, dialogue with, 71
 Tübingen, University of, 280, 442; school at, 626
 Turkish empire, recent events in, 558, 559; Protestant missions in, 592, 593
 Turks, the, 256, 261, 266, 296, 305, 306, 314, 317, 391
 Tuscany, ecclesiastical reforms in, 505
 Twisten, 627
 Tyndale, William, 346, 347, 352, 353, 354
 Ulrich von Hutten, 282, 285, 298, 303
 Ulrici, 634
 Ultramontanism, 535, 541, 542, 546
Unam Sanctum, the bull, 242
 Uction, extreme, 226; Wyclif on, 274
 Uniformity, Act of, 375, 381, 460, 486
Unigenitus, the bull, 504
 Union Theological Seminary, 572
 Unitarianism in Poland, 313; in New England, 562, 615, 616. See, also, Socinianism
 "United Brethren," the, 579. See, also, Moravians, the
 United Presbyterian Church of Scotland, 556, 587, 592; of America, 573, 594
 United Secession Church of Scotland, 556
 United States, early religious history of, 559 *seq.*; rise of missionary activity in, 587, 588
 Universalism in America, 617, 618. See, also, Restorationism
 Universe, the, origin of, Scotus Erigena on, 180
 "Universities Mission," the, 594
 Updegraph case, the, 561
 Urban II. on exemption of clergy from civil jurisdiction, 201; starts the crusades, 186. V., 250. VI., 250 *seq.* VIII., 412, 504
 Ussher, 374, 379, 382, 405, 448
 "Utopia," 284
 Utraquists, the, 260, 261, 313. See, also, Bohemian Brethren, Moravians
 Utrecht Union, the, 345
 Uytendogaert, 429
 VALDEZ, Juan, 385
 Valens, 91, 101
 Valentinian I., 100. II., 91. III., 78, 107
 Valentinus, 76
 Valerian, 49
 Valerius, 127
 Valladolid, Protestantism in, 396
 Vandals, the, 94, 95, 127
 Vanderkemp, 594
 Van Dyck, 592
 Vane, 472, 473, 485, 486
 Vasa, Gustavus, 312
 Vasco da Gama, 288, 449
 Vassili III., 556
 Vassy, massacre of, 337
 Vatican, the, decorated, 269; library of, beginning of, 263; printing-press in, 411
 Vatican Council, the, 537
 Vandois, the, 333, 334
 Venial sins, 141
 Venice, 193, 266, 267, 268, 288, 304, 385, 411, 412
 Venn, Henry, 522
 Vergerio, 389
 Versions of the Scriptures, 79, 93, 125, 176, 274, 299, 346, 352, 354, 382, 390, 467, 551, 587, 590 *seq.*
 Verviers, Peace of, 411
 Vespasian, 46
 Vestments of the clergy, 121; Puritan controversy about, 375, 376

- "Vestry," the, in Virginia, 476
 Victor IV., anti-pope, 190
 Victor Immanuel, 537
 Vienna, University of, 499
 Vienne, Church founded in, 45; persecution of Christians in, 48; council of, 245
 Vigilantius of Barcelona, 118
 Villafranca, Peace of, 540
 Vincent of Lerins, his career, 128
 Vinet, 549
 Viret, 324
 Virginia, early laws of, 469; the Church in, 475, 476; repeals laws against Baptists, etc., 560
 Virginia Company, the, 463
 Virgins, order of, 62
 Virtues, the, division of by the schoolmen, 323
 "Vision of Piers' Ploughman," 278
 Vladimír, 165
 Voltaire, 285, 494, 543; his career, 618, 620
 Vulgate, the, made by Jerome, 125; authorized edition of, 389, 411, 438
- WAIBLINGS, the, 188
 Wake, on Episcopacy, 379
 Waldenses, the, 204, 219, 272, 330, 333, 424
 Waldenström, 548
 Waldo, Peter, 204, 333
 Wallenstein, 409, 410
 Wallis, John, 601
 Walpole, Robert, 512
 Walsingham, 377
 War, mitigation of sufferings caused by, 659
 Warburton, 419, 605, 606
 Ward, William, 550
 Wardlaw, Ralph, 553
 Ware, Henry, 616
 Warham, 349, 352
 Washington, 660
 Waterland, Daniel, 432, 601, 605
 Watson, R., 629
 Watts, 513, 523, 524, 611
 Wayland, Francis, 564
 Webb, Thomas, 576
 Webster, Daniel, 561
 Wegscheider, 623
 Wells, the, 188
 Wellhausen, 622
 Wellington, 534
 Welsh Calvinistic Methodists, the, 520
 Welz, Baron von, 451
 Wends, the, conversion of, 165
 Wentworth, the Earl of Strafford, 401, 403, 404
 Wenzel, 255, 275
 Wesley, Charles, 515, 516, 518, 521, 522, 663
 Wesley, John, on witchcraft, 482; his remark on the influence of William Law, 513; his early career, 515, 516; begins his work, 517; remains a member of the English Church, 518; his remark on Fletcher, 519; his teaching *ib.*; effect of his preaching, 521; compared with Whitefield, *ib.*, 522; results of his work, 522; promotes Methodism in America, 576, 577; and Toplady, 610; influence on the Sunday School, 656
 Wesleyan Missionary Society, the, 586
 Wessel, John, 276
 Westminster Assembly, the, 405, 467; catechisms, 405; confession, *ib.*, 406; creeds, 382, 427, 442, 445, 448
 Westphalia, Peace of, 410
 Wettstein, 429
 Whateley, Richard, 632
 Wheelwright, 473
 Whichcot, 593
 Whiston, William, 601, 605
 Whitaker, Alexander, 475
 Whitby, Daniel, 601, 611
 Whitby, conference at, 148
 White, William, 567, 568
 White Sunday, the, or the *dominica in albis*, 119
 Whitefield, George, his early career, 514; as a field preacher, 517; becomes a Calvinist, 519; force of his preaching, 520; compared with Wesley, 521; his influence on the Established Church, 522; excites disapproval, 524; in New England, 525
 Whitgift, 372, 378, 398, 448, 461
 Widows, order of, 62
 Wilberforce, William, 523, 536, 632, 660
 Wilfred, Abp. of York, 148, 149
 Will, the Apostolic Fathers on, 80; Pelagius on, 136; Augustine on, *ib.*; Chrysostom on, 137; Theodore of Mopsuestia on, *ib.*; Cassian on, 138; Aquinas on, 220; Duns Scotus on, *ib.*; Calvin on, 321; Spinoza on, 437; Locke on, 603; Collins on, 605; Hume on, 609; Edwards on, 611
 Willehad, 152
 William I., of England, the Conqueror, 184, 211, 230. II. (Rufus), 186, 211. III., of England, 490, 509, 554
 William of Orange, the Silent, his rank and character, 342, 343; declares against persecution, 343; condemns iconoclasm, 344; takes up arms, *ib.*; condemns Protestant intolerance, 345; on the relations of Church and State, 346; assassinated, 345
 William of Champeaux, 212, 214
 Williams, Roger, his career, 470 *seq.*, 563
 Willibrord, 150
 Wilson, Daniel, 651
 Wilson, John, 591
 Wilson, Margaret, 489
 Wilson, Thomas, 513
 Winifred. See Boniface
 Winthrop, John, 464, 473
 Wiseman, Cardinal, 552
 Wishart, George, 364
 Witchcraft delusion, the, 479 *seq.*
 Witches, belief of the early Germans in, 145
 Witherspoon, John, 571
 Witiza, 157
 Witsius, 428

- Wittekind, 152
 Wittenberg, disturbances at, 299; University of, admits the new studies, 280; hearth of the Reformation, 291 *seq.*
 Wolf, 620
 Wolmar, Melchior, 319
 Wolsey, Cardinal, 346
 Woman's Board, the, 588
 Woods, Leonard, 616
 Woolston, Thomas, 605
 Works, good, 141; the Reformers on, 444
 Worms, Diet of, 297, 298
 Wyat, 362
 Wyclif, John, on the papacy, 252; influenced by Occam, 271; his career, 273; his doctrinal views, *ib.*, 274; his death, 274; his influence in Bohemia, *ib.*, 275; his continued influence in England, 346
 XAVIER, FRANCIS, joins Loyola, 387; canonized, 412, 455; his missionary career, 452 *seq.*; on his method, 453, 454; on the Japanese, 454; on the opposition of the devil to the Jesuit missions, *ib.*; beatified, 455
 Ximenes, Cardinal, 450
 YALE COLLEGE, 526, 562
 Young, Brigham, 582
 Young Men's Christian Association, 662, 663
 ZELANTI, the, 533
 Zeller, 626
 Zenana Mission, the, 591
 Zeno, 11
 Ziegenbalg, 584, 589
 Zinzendorf, 506, 507, 585
 Ziska, 260
 Zoroastrianism, 98
 Zosimus, 137
 Zurich, the Reformation at, 307, 308, 323; defeated by the Forest cantons, 310; Church and State in, 417; the Anabaptists in, 425
 Zwickau, prophets of, 299
 Zwingli, Ulrich, 290; his early career, 306; his patriotism, *ib.*, 307; at Zurich, 307; compared with Luther, 308, 309; his marriage, 308; his writings, *ib.*; his doctrinal teaching, *ib.*; on the Lord's supper, 309; his controversy with Luther, *ib.*, 310; at Marburg, 310; influences of, in Hungary, 314; on Christian government, 417; his ideas on worship, 421; on the Apocalypse, 439; on the sinfulness of man, 441; on predestination, 442; his death, 310

CHURCH HISTORY.

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX: The Times, the Man, and his Work. An Historical Study in Eight Lectures. By RICHARD S. STORRS. 8vo, \$2.50.

THE BEGINNINGS OF CHRISTIANITY. With a View of the State of the Roman World at the Birth of Christ. By GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Church History in Yale College. 8vo, \$2.50.

THE BOSTON ADVERTISER.—“Prof. Fisher has displayed in this, as in his previous published writings, that catholicity and that calm judicial quality of mind which are so indispensable to a true historical critic.”

THE EXAMINER.—“The volume is not a dry repetition of well-known facts. It bears the marks of original research. Every page glows with freshness of material and choiceness of diction.”

THE EVANGELIST.—“The volume contains an amount of information that makes it one of the most useful of treatises for a student in philosophy and theology, and must secure for it a place in his library as a standard authority.”

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Yale University. 8vo, with numerous maps, \$3 50.

This work is in several respects notable. It gives an able presentation of the subject in a single volume, thus supplying the need of a complete and at the same time condensed survey of Church History. It will also be found much broader and more comprehensive than other books of the kind.

HON. GEORGE BANCROFT.—“I have to tell you of the pride and delight with which I have examined your rich and most instructive volume. As an American, let me thank you for producing a work so honorable to the country.”

REV. R. S. STORRS, D.D.—“I am surprised that the author has been able to put such multitudes of facts, with analysis of opinions, definitions of tendencies, and concise personal sketches, into a narrative at once so graceful, graphic, and compact.”

PROF. ALEXANDER V. G. ALLEN, *Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass.*—“It has the merit of being eminently readable, its conclusions rest on the widest research and the latest and best scholarship, it keeps a just sense of proportion in the treatment of topics, it is written in the interest of Christianity as a whole and not of any sect or church, it is so entirely impartial that it is not easy to discern the author's sympathies or his denominational attitude, and it has the great advantage of dwelling at due length upon English and American Church history. In short, it is a work which no one but a long and successful teacher of Church History could have produced.”

SCRIBNER'S TEXT-BOOK CATALOGUE.

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD UPON THE EARTH. By Rev. SAMUEL J. ANDREWS. Considered in its Historical, Chronological, and Geographical Relations. New and revised edition from new plates, with maps and plans. Crown 8vo, \$2.50.

The continued demand for this book shows that it meets a want not otherwise adequately met. While it deals with the life of the Lord on earth in its chronological, topographical, and historical relations especially, the work offers far more than a harmony of the Gospels, valuable as that is, since here the skeleton harmony is filled out with all the life and logic of daily walk and conversation. The elements of time and place are discussed as important toward convincing men of Christ's earthly existence and giving a distinct picture of His labors, His outward circumstances, His relations to those about Him.

In the matter of chronology, this work is unquestionably of the first and highest authority, and this revised edition presents the results of the latest investigation and discovery.

THE CHURCHMAN.—"There will not soon be any which can take its place."

THE SUNDAY SCHOOL TIMES.—"Indispensable to the ever-growing class of real students."

EVANGELIST.—"Should be in every minister's library."

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., New Haven. [See **MENTAL** and **MORAL SCIENCE**.]

HISTORY OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE IN THE TIME OF OUR LORD. By Dr. EMIL SCHÜRER, Professor of Theology in the University of Giessen. Translated from the second edition (revised throughout and greatly enlarged) of *History of the New Testament Time*.

Heretofore issued in parts, but now complete in a form convenient for general readers. First division. 2 vols. Political History of Palestine from B.C. 175, to A.D. 135. Second division. 3 vols. Internal Condition of Palestine, and of the Jewish People in the time of Christ. With Index to the entire work, in all 5 vols., 8vo, net, \$8.00. Single volumes supplied only in the English edition at \$3.00 per volume and \$1.50 additional for the Index.

Examines into and describes that realm of thought and history in which the universal religion of Christ grew up. The surroundings, prevalent tendencies of thought, spiritual and intellectual life, and the extensive, varied literature of the time, are among the treasures set forth.

ENGLISH CHURCHMAN.—"Under Professor Schürer's guidance, we are enabled to a large extent to construct a social and political frame-work for the Gospel History, and to set it in such a light as to see new evidences of the truthfulness of that history and of its contemporaneity."

. . . The length of our notice shows our estimate of the value of his work."

BRITISH QUARTERLY REVIEW.—"As a hand-book for the study of the New Testament, the work is invaluable and unique."

CHURCH HISTORY.

HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D. New Edition, re-written and enlarged. Vol. I.—Apostolic Christianity, A.D. 1–100. Vol. II.—Ante-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 100–325. Vol. III.—Nicene and Post-Nicene Christianity, A.D. 311–600. Vol. IV.—Mediæval Christianity, A.D. 590–1073. Vol. VI.—Modern Christianity. The German Reformation, A.D. 1517–1530. Vol. VII.—The Period of the Swiss Reformation. 8vo, price per vol., \$4.00.

This work is extremely comprehensive. All subjects that properly belong to a complete sketch are treated, including the history of Christian art, hymnology, accounts of the lives and chief works of the Fathers of the Church, etc. The great theological, christological, and anthropological controversies of the period are duly sketched; and in all the details of history the organizing hand of a master is distinctly seen, shaping the mass of materials into order and system.

PROF. GEO. P. FISHER, of *Yale College*.—"Dr. Schaff has thoroughly and successfully accomplished his task. The volumes are replete with evidences of a careful study of the original sources and of an extraordinary and, we might say, unsurpassed acquaintance with the modern literature—German, French, and English—in the department of ecclesiastical history. They are equally marked by a fair-minded, conscientious spirit, as well as by a lucid, animated mode of presentation."

PROF. ROSWELL D. HITCHCOCK, D.D..—"In no other single work of its kind with which I am acquainted will students and general readers find so much to instruct and interest them."

DR. JUL. MULLER, of *Halle*.—"It is the only history of the first six centuries which truly satisfies the wants of the present age. It is rich in results of original investigation."

HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, IN CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES. A Synchronistic View of the Events, Characteristics, and Culture of each period, including the History of Polity, Worship, Literature, and Doctrines, together with two Supplementary Tables upon the Church in America; and an Appendix, containing the series of Councils, Popes, Patriarchs, and other Bishops, and a full Index. By the late HENRY B. SMITH, D.D., Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of the City of New York. Folio, \$5.00.

REV. DR. W. G. T. SHEDD.—"Prof. Smith's Historical Tables are the best that I know of in any language. In preparing such a work, with so much care and research, Prof. Smith has furnished to the student an apparatus that will be of life-long service to him."

REV. DR. WILLIAM ADAMS.—"The labor expended upon such a work is immense, and its accuracy and completeness do honor to the research and scholarship of its author, and are an invaluable acquisition to our literature."

SCRIBNER'S TEXT-BOOK CATALOGUE.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE JEWISH CHURCH. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. With Maps and Plans. New Edition from New Plates, with the author's latest revision. Part I.—From Abraham to Samuel. Part II.—From Samuel to the Captivity. Part III.—From the Captivity to the Christian Era. Three vols., 12mo (sold separately), each \$2.00.

The same—Westminster Edition. Three vols., 8vo (sold in sets only), per set, \$9.00.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH. With an introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. New Edition from New Plates. 12mo, \$2.00.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. 8vo, \$1.50.

In all that concerns the external characteristics of the scenes and persons described, Dr. Stanley is entirely at home. His books are not dry records of historic events, but animated pictures of historic scenes and of the actors in them, while the human motives and aspects of events are brought out in bold and full relief.

THE LONDON CRITIC.—“Earnest, eloquent, learned, with a style that is never monotonous, but luring through its eloquence, the lectures will maintain his fame as author, scholar, and divine. We could point out many passages that glow with a true poetic fire, but there are hundreds pictorially rich and poetically true. The reader experiences no weariness, for in every page and paragraph there is something to engage the mind and refresh the soul.”

THE NEW ENGLANDER.—“We have first to express our admiration of the grace and graphic beauty of his style. The felicitous discrimination in the use of language which appears on every page is especially required on these topics, where the author's position might so easily be mistaken through an unguarded statement. Dr. Stanley is possessed of the prime quality of an historical student and writer—namely, the historical feeling, or sense, by which conditions of life and types of character, remote from our present experience, are vividly conceived of and truly appreciated.”

THE N. Y. TIMES.—“The Old Testament History is here presented as it never was presented before; with so much clearness, elegance of style, and historic and literary illustration, not to speak of learning and calmness of judgment, that not theologians alone, but also cultivated readers generally, are drawn to its pages. In point of style it takes rank with Macaulay's History and the best chapters of Froude.”

FAMILY OF FAITH COLLEGE LIBRARY
History of the Christian church,
Ref BR145.F5



3480400026345